


NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08236645 5

AN
(Hamilton, A)

Hamilton College



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

ALEXANDER HAMILTON

*THIRTY-ONE ORATIONS
DELIVERED AT HAMILTON
COLLEGE FROM 1864 TO
1895 UPON THE PRIZE
FOUNDATION ESTAB-
LISHED BY FRANKLIN
HARVEY HEAD, A. M.*

COLLECTED AND EDITED BY

MELVIN GILBERT DODGE, A.M.

Librarian of Hamilton College

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

NEW YORK


LONDON

27 WEST TWENTY-THIRD STREET

24 BEDFORD STREET, STRAND

The Knickerbocker Press

1896



COPYRIGHT, 1896
BY
MELVIN GILBERT DODGE

The Knickerbocker Press, New Rochelle, N. Y.



NOTE.

THE present volume is the second of the series to contain the prize orations delivered at Hamilton College. The fact that some of the prize orations can not be found argues strongly for the publication of the rest, thus placing them in permanent form. One only of the Head-Prize orations is lacking, that by Luther A. Ostrander of '65. The single copy which is known to have been in existence was lost in the Chicago fire.

I wish to thank Professor Root for his generous contribution to the volume. To him, a member of the same class with Mr. Head, and a professor for many years in Hamilton College, the founding and growth of the prize have not been without interest.

M. G. D.





CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NOTE	iii
INTRODUCTION	ix
<i>Professor Oren Root, D.D., L.H.D.</i>	
HAMILTON AS A CONSTITUTIONAL STATESMAN	i
<i>Franklin H. Head, '56.</i>	
THE CHARACTER AND STATESMANSHIP OF HAMIL- TON	ii
<i>Willard Peck, '64.</i>	
HAMILTON AS AN EXPOUNDER OF THE CONSTITU- TION	18
<i>Hannibal Smith, '66.</i>	
THE INTELLECTUAL RANK OF HAMILTON AMONG HIS CONTEMPORARIES	25
<i>Amory H. Bradford, '67.</i>	
HAMILTON AS A POLITICAL PROPHET	32
<i>John D. Henderson, '68.</i>	
THE RELATIONS OF HAMILTON AND BURR	39
<i>Charles H. Searle, '69.</i>	
OUR POLITICAL INDEBTEDNESS TO HAMILTON	46
<i>Thomas H. Abbott, '70.</i>	

	PAGE
HAMILTON COMPARED WITH HIS EUROPEAN CON- TEMPORARIES	53
<i>James L. Bennett, '71.</i>	
THE POSITION OF HAMILTON IN AMERICAN HIS- TORY	59
<i>J. Henry Shepherd, '72.</i>	
THE CAREER AND CHARACTER OF HAMILTON .	66
<i>Oliver E. Branch, '73.</i>	
ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND THOMAS JEFFERSON .	73
<i>George W. Knox, '74.</i>	
THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE POLITICAL DOCTRINES OF HAMILTON	79
<i>William H. De Witt, '75.</i>	
ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND SALMON P. CHASE .	85
<i>Howard P. Eells, '76.</i>	
HAMILTON AND SEWARD AS POLITICAL LEADERS .	90
<i>Henry W. Cockerill, '77.</i>	
ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND LOUIS ADOLPHE THIERS	95
<i>Carlos H. Stone, '78.</i>	
THE DEATH OF HAMILTON	101
<i>Charles E. DeWitt, '79.</i>	
THE POLITICAL DOCTRINES OF HAMILTON IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT AMERICAN HISTORY . .	107
<i>Philip A. Laing, '80.</i>	
HAMILTON AND THE TARIFF QUESTION . .	113
<i>Harmon F. Bliss, '81.</i>	
ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND BENJAMIN DISRAELI,	118
<i>Herbert H. Parsons, '82.</i>	
THE POLITICAL SERVICES OF HAMILTON AND WEBSTER	125
<i>Edwin B. Root, '83.</i>	

THE DEBT OF OUR GOVERNMENT TO WASHINGTON AND HAMILTON	130
<i>Edward M. Barber, '84.</i>	
HAMILTON AND THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1800	136
<i>Edmund F. Wager, '85.</i>	
THE MILITARY SERVICES OF HAMILTON	142
<i>William H. Hotchkiss, '86.</i>	
THE VERDICT OF EXPERIENCE ON HAMILTON'S CONSTITUTIONAL THEORIES	147
<i>John G. Peck, '87.</i>	
HAMILTON AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVEN- TION OF 1787	153
<i>Edmund R. Wilcox, '88.</i>	
THE INFLUENCE OF THE "FEDERALIST" . . .	159
<i>James D. Rogers, '89.</i>	
HAMILTON, WEBSTER, SEWARD	164
<i>Walstein Root, '90.</i>	
THE PRINCIPLES THAT DISTINGUISH HAMILTON AND JEFFERSON AS STATESMEN	170
<i>George M. Weaver, '91.</i>	
ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND JOHN ADAMS . .	175
<i>John M. Curran, '92.</i>	
HAMILTON AS A LAWYER	180
<i>Daniel W. E. Burke, '93.</i>	
HAMILTON AND THE CODE OF HONOR	185
<i>Leroy F. Ostrander, '94.</i>	
HAMILTON'S THEORY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE	190
<i>John B. Seymour, '95.</i>	



INTRODUCTION.



THESE orations are the result of competition for a prize endowed by the Hon. Franklin H. Head of Chicago.

No name from the rolls of our struggle for independence and our binding together as a nation awakens more intense interest or opens wider fields for consideration than that of Hamilton. From the first appearance of the youthful student, to the tragic hour on the heights of Weehawken, the story has the attraction of romance, and in it can be found the kindling of influences potent not only for then but for all time.

In the very beginning of his plan to found an institution of learning, Samuel Kirkland sought the counsel of Hamilton and received his approval. Hamilton was one of the first trustees, and in recognition of his encouragement the institution received his name. It is fitting that this College should call special attention to Alexander Hamilton.

Soon after the establishment of prizes for English essays, the Faculty announced as a subject for the Senior class, "Alexander Hamilton as a Constitu-

tional Statesman." The prize on this subject was awarded in a vigorous competition to Franklin H. Head of the Class of 1856, who evinced in College the marked ability he has shown so fully since.

In 1863, the Senior prizes for essays having been withdrawn, Mr. Head established the prize called by his name, designating that the subject for this Prize Oration year by year should have reference to the character and career of Alexander Hamilton. The first Head-Prize was awarded to Willard Peck of the Class of 1864, then as now of Hudson, N. Y. Since that year the prize has been awarded annually; the successful orations form the body of this volume.

The writers were young men, varying in age at the date of writing from nineteen to twenty-five years. They magnify in some respects the work and influence of Hamilton; but readers will find less tendency in this direction than would be expected of young writers.

It is believed that these efforts grouped about the life of Hamilton will be of interest to many and will at least show how constant Hamilton College is to the memory of the great leader.

OREN ROOT.

CLINTON, N. Y.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON



ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS A CONSTITUTIONAL STATESMAN.

SUCCESSFUL PRIZE ESSAY BY FRANKLIN H. HEAD, '56.



HE aspirations of the most ambitious can reach to no more lofty position than that of the true statesman. He who has fashioned an institution in which is made practical some great idea, and who has thus identified himself with the interest of a perpetual order of men, has exercised the noblest attribute of human reason, and is to be classed among the world's benefactors.

In speaking of the constitutional statesman, we mean him who acts in the inauguration of great principles or rules of action in government; or him who expounds and sustains by argument those principles when inaugurated. Such an one needs a

familiar acquaintance with history ; an original, inventive, powerful mind, and undoubted patriotism. He stands to make and judge upon the foundations of government. The highest order of intellect is necessary. The man must be a philosopher.

Alexander Hamilton met these requirements. He brought to the service of the state a thorough knowledge of its wants, together with a mind fraught with all the governmental learning of the past. His turn of thought was neither purely speculative nor rigidly practical, but rather one combining the excellencies of both. He originated, if exigencies demanded, new views and new principles, yet tested them ever by the severest logic. He ensured success to his projects by their adaptation to the universal nature of man. He was familiar both with the rules of right reason and their right application.

His mind was singularly comprehensive, grasping at once the broadest underlying principles and the minutest practical details.

To this intellect, versatile as it was gigantic, he added a temper fitted for patient investigation, and habits of indefatigable industry, rarely accompanying such scope of genius.

Hamilton's labors as a framer of our present governmental policy commenced years before the Convention of 1787. While a member of the "Old Congress" he appreciated the evils of the existing system, and with characteristic foresight saw and suggested the remedy. He made plain the necessity of a stable national government and indicated

the only means by which it could be instituted. His ideas, inculcated with earnestness and based upon incontrovertible "first truths," lived in the minds of his auditors and were manifested in their acts.

In his extensive correspondence too, with the sages and patriots of the Revolution, he was ever pointing out the necessity for a radical change in the polity of the nation, and thus contributing in no inconsiderable degree to raise the tone of public opinion to a level with his own. As a marked instance of this latter method of inculcating his views we may cite his letter to James Duane (1780), in which is not only a clear and convincing demonstration of the necessity of a modification of the existing government and of the Articles of Confederation then awaiting the ratification of the States, but also a foreshadowing of all the essential changes which should constitute this modification. So exactly is his plan in accordance with the one subsequently adopted by the framers of the Constitution, as to fully warrant the assertion that Hamilton was, to a greater extent than any other man, the author and father of that imperishable instrument.

After a full and fair trial, the Articles of Confederation were adjudged an insufficient basis for governmental action. The Convention of 1787 was assembled.

Among the eminent men who acted as members of this Convention none were, by the nature of their previous studies and experience, better fitted for the momentous duties required than Hamilton. His

service as secretary and aide-de-camp to Washington had given him an intimate knowledge of the real state and requirements of the country. He was too, wholly free from State interest and sectional prejudices. A foreigner, looking upon the State boundaries as mere political divisions which might at any time vanish, he embraced a continent within the scope of his mental vision, and legislated in view of the happiness and welfare of a nation.

The course of Hamilton, while a member of the Convention, has been the theme, alternately, of extravagant praise and bitter censure. He has been charged with entertaining views hostile to our institutions, and of favoring the establishment of a monarchy; statements unquestionably at variance with fact. That in his theoretical convictions he leaned strongly toward a monarchy as it exists under the English Constitution is not denied, but he saw and avowed its utter want of adaptation to the people of the United States, and pressed his convictions no farther than to seek to incorporate into the American system, the vigor and stability of the English Constitution.

Hamilton's ideal of a government was one which he was conscious must, from the frailty of human nature, ever be unattainable; a government which should unite the strength and permanency of a monarchy with the most perfect security to liberty. As near an approximation as possible to this ideal was what he labored to effect. In accordance with this view, the fundamental idea which underlies nearly all his propositions is, that the Union about

to be formed should be a "Coercive Union," one the government of which should act directly on the people as individuals, without the intervention of State legislation. During the Confederation the laws of Congress had the force merely of recommendations; he would have the officers of the nation fully empowered to execute its laws.

Although from the incompleteness of the reported proceedings of the Convention we cannot assign with precision the parts due to the exertions of Hamilton, yet the modifications of the first submitted plans in accordance with his previously avowed opinions; the close resemblance of the perfected system to his own plan; and most of all, the embodiment in it of the great and most important idea, its action upon the people independent of the State governments, bear witness to his efficient participation in the constructive labors of the Convention.

The Constitution, having been matured, was submitted to the people for their decision. Here Hamilton appears in a new character, an expounder. Rarely does it happen that the same man can perform creditably the functions of the legislator and of the jurist. Not often is the original, creative, practical mind of the one united with the discriminating judgment and keen analytical powers of the other. But in the mind of Hamilton were combined these seldom associated powers.

In the expounding of the Constitution, a new and wholly untried field for the display of judicial learning, he was without a rival. The "Federalist"

at once laid the foundation, and well-nigh completed the superstructure of American constitutional law. Subsequent laborers upon this structure have done little else than more fully to carry out and elaborate the views of Hamilton. In this luminous and eloquent commentary on our institutions, more than in any other production of his pen, are displayed his familiarity with the principles of all government; his power of perceiving the weak points in governmental theories, and his intimate knowledge of all the political philosophy of the foregone times. His share in this work alone would entitle him to the position of the first and soundest expositor of our Constitution.

His labors in this department of statesmanship, however, ended not with the publication of this work. Called into the cabinet of the President at a period when constitutional questions were necessarily of frequent occurrence, his opinions were constantly sought by Washington, and almost without exception formed the rule of action for that exalted patriot. To assert this is no derogation from the wisdom and sound judgment of Washington, who ever had the magnanimity, inseparable from true greatness, to select and embrace counsels worthy of attention and respect.

Those of his cabinet papers which discuss the points, then much controverted, of the constitutionality of a national bank and of a tariff for the protection of manufactures are completely exhaustive of those subjects. Arguing from the position that the grant of a power was by implication the grant

of means to render it effective, his reasoning is conclusive. From that time the power of Congress to institute a bank or tariff has scarcely been questioned; the expediency of their establishment alone has engaged the attention of our legislators.

To animate and put in operation the newly formed government was a task scarcely less difficult than its construction. An error in its early working might have converted the very system of checks and balances intended to secure its permanency into the most fatal weapons for its destruction. At this crisis, had not Hamilton been the adviser of Washington, the infant Republic might never have matured into a manly nation. Hamilton defined the proper sphere of the national government. He prescribed the bounds to the authority of its different departments. He illustrated the spirit which should guide in the interpretation of its laws. To his exertions our nation owes no small part of the blessings which have followed the harmonious working of her Constitution.

Of the correctness of Hamilton's views time and experience have brought abundant proof. The danger to the Union has ever been rather from State than from federal usurpation. The deficiencies of the Constitution are precisely those which he foresaw and against which he labored. The most important amendments to that instrument were originally his suggestions. Not in the least exaggerated is the philosophic Guizot's estimate of his genius, "Hamilton must be classed among the men who have best known the vital principles and fundamental condi-

tions of a government worthy of its mission and of its name."

Hamilton cared little for personal popularity. Looking upon men merely as passive instruments he adjusted to them his modes of policy, not to suit their momentary caprices, but by following theories, of the soundness of which he was assured by his unerring perception of what was practicable and expedient. He considered that while the sensibilities would prompt men to deeds noble and heroic, they were yet an unsafe dependence for the stated operations of a government. Entertaining this view of the value to be attached to the popular judgment he spoke to his countrymen what he believed to be the truth concerning themselves, even at the risk of his popularity and influence. To do this required moral courage of the highest order; a courage which a great statesman must have; a courage which, exerted at a later period, would have saved to his country a valuable life, and left his own character free from what must now be regarded as its deepest stain.

Hamilton unquestionably underrated the capacity of the American people for self-government. He had too low an opinion of the wisdom and stability of our democracy. Yet even here he drew conclusions logically correct from premises in history and experience. There was not then an existing republic worthy the name. The crushed and dismembered commonwealths of the past proclaimed with united voice a republican form of government to be at once the most difficult and the most dangerous.

Our own Confederacy, its government nerveless, its people desponding, its States in collision, confirmed the same great truth. The State governments, unregulated by a stable national head, presented melancholy spectacles of weakness and inefficiency. How then could Hamilton be warranted in arguing that the American people were to inaugurate a new era in governmental history? How could he infer the existence of those moral and educational restraints upon the passions of which there had been as yet almost no manifestation?

To speak of Hamilton as a soldier, an orator, a financier, or an administrative statesman comes not within the purview of our subject. The fact however that in each of these positions he was distinguished illustrates still farther the vastness of his intellect, the inexhaustible fertility of its resources, and the all-embracing nature of his genius.

In the light of these facts and reflections we may estimate the character of Hamilton as a constitutional statesman. He possessed an intellect that mastered constitutions, governments, and men. His theories were based on first principles, and herein is his excellence as a constitutional statesman. Government was to him a science; not an art. He sought for principles, not in precedents, but in the nature of things. He used history and experience, not as rulers, but as guides. Most men would have been satisfied to equal the past. Hamilton, rising with the spirit of a new world, bearing its burden, grasped at and attained a new order of government. Only such men as he were able to form a Constitu-

tion worthy and fit for America. He was the master spirit of 1787.

The whole scope of his mind was original and adapted to the times. He labored to acquire for his country glory, as he himself said, by the steady, uniform, unshaken security of constitutional freedom. Zealously and well did he toil for this in the Philadelphia Convention; in the New York assembly for ratification; in his arduous labors in the administration of Washington. His expositions of the Constitution are unrivaled. He was the thinker of the age; the man to whom, more than any other, the American people are indebted for the solidity and perpetuity of their institutions.





THE CHARACTER AND STATESMANSHIP OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

BY WILLARD PECK, '64.



OME had her household gods in her illustrious dead.

By the glory of their ancestors the hearts of her sons were fired with that valor and patriotism which crowned their city queen of the world. America too has her Penates in the orators that initiated, in the warriors that achieved, in the statesmen that secured, the success of the Revolution. The sterling principle, the exalted patriotism, and the intellectual strength of that period are most brilliantly exemplified in the character and statesmanship of Alexander Hamilton.

Hamilton inherited from his parents their national characteristics. From his father he received the mental acumen, the sterling sense, and the high principle of the Scotchman; from his mother, the warm impulses, the refined sensibilities, and the chivalric honor of the Huguenot. Hamilton was thus by nature the affectionate husband, the faithful friend, the true gentleman, and the zealous patriot.

The distinguishing feature of Hamilton's character was intellectual power. The higher faculties of his mind reigned supreme. His feelings were as warm and his fancy as bright as the sun of his native Indies, but they never dazzled his reason or blinded his judgment. His mind was capable of keen analysis and broad generalization. Unflinching courage, unflagging energy, and untiring industry were also his. An indomitable will, wielding superior mental faculties, gave to his character the attribute of executive power. Hamilton's life thus became a series of splendid intellectual achievements. As the secretary of Washington he was the brain of the Revolution; as a writer and an orator he moulded public opinion; and as a statesman he solved the problems of finance and government.

Nor was Hamilton's character devoid of moral greatness. As a citizen, a lawyer, and a soldier, high principle ever controlled his conduct. Regardless of his own interests he ever espoused the cause of truth and justice and devoted himself with a spirit of self-sacrifice to his country.

In accepting the challenge of Burr to fight the duel in which he lost his life, Hamilton indeed disobeyed his convictions of right. He thought that to decline would impugn his courage and sully his honor. He erred; but it was the fault of a chivalric nature, a fault expiated in his death. Character finds its true expression in life. In the boy in business at fourteen, in the collegian swaying by his eloquence the people of New York, in the young captain in the vanguard of American freemen, in

the confidential adviser of Washington, in the keen lawyer, the shrewd politician, the able editor, the comprehensive statesman, the true patriot, and the noble gentleman, Hamilton presents a mosaic of human character, wonderful in its combinations, striking in its contrasts, and grand in its integrity. The character of Hamilton moulded his statesmanship. Intellectual, moral, and executive power has stamped his work with the impress of utility, patriotism, and truth. Let us examine his political philosophy and then estimate.

In the Convention of '87 Hamilton advocated the strongest form of central republican government. History had pronounced pure democracy a failure. The American Revolution had discovered the weakness of confederation. A republic upon the confines of monarchy was the ideal of Hamilton. A distinguishing feature of Hamilton's theory was the appointment of State officers and the revision of State laws by the federal executive; and by this virtual consolidation of the States to create a central power which should "unite, pervade, and invigorate the whole country." Sectional prejudice may become stronger than national pride. The natural supports of government are the interests and necessities of the citizens. A centralized government would have pledged these principles to the maintenance of national faith, honor, and integrity. Secession would have been not only unconstitutional but impossible.

Another distinguishing feature of Hamilton's theory was in the organization of the Senate. He

would have made it a select legislative body whose members should be chosen for life by the landed proprietors of the nation. The people are not infallible. *Vox populi* is not *vox Dei*. A reckless democracy is the most terrible of despotisms. Freed by its tenure of office from the influence of popular passion, a senate thus constituted would have been a great conservative element in the government.

Still another feature of Hamilton's theory was to strengthen the executive. Upon the administration depends the efficiency of every system. The noblest government ever devised by philosophy, without ability to maintain its authority, is contemptible. The liberty and safety of the citizens are the true objects of government. Hamilton would have clothed the executive with strength commensurate with these objects. He would have created an executive, single in person, permanent in tenure, and independent in power. Such in general are Hamilton's peculiar views as a constitutional statesman. Strength was his ideal; to found a permanent republic, his object.

On account of these views Hamilton has been reproached as a monarchist. The charge is unwarrantable. He declared that a republic only could be founded in America. Hamilton was the intelligent patriot. He sought to establish the Republic upon the basis of law. The government of England was his model, not to copy but to imitate.

Hamilton was a national statesman. Free from local prejudice his care was not for the interest of the States but of the nation. Hamilton was a prac-

tical statesman. He recognized facts and regarded man not as he ought to be but as he was. Hamilton was a true conservative statesman. Like Hampden and Lafayette he opposed all oppression, whether of the monarch or the mob. Hamilton was the philosophic statesman. History was the oracle from which he drew his political inspiration. He analyzed human action and made its motives the basis of his science of government. Hamilton was a comprehensive statesman. He never proposed measures but always advocated principles. In his political philosophy he studied the past and embraced the future. The work for the state and the spirit which he imparts to its institutions are the crowning glory of the statesman.

The first work of Hamilton was the education of public opinion to the adoption of the Constitution. By pen and voice he stimulates the national thought. During the Revolution he discovered to the leading minds of the day the imbecility of the old Confederation and demonstrated the necessity of a stronger government. At the conclusion of the war, through the press and in the forum, Hamilton urged upon the people the consideration of the mighty question of government; and by continuous effort succeeded in assembling the States in constitutional convention. The composition of that body indicated the temper of the people. Many members were pledged to resist any change; others were absorbed in the interests of their respective States. Hamilton presented the testimony of history, developed established truths, pictured to their minds his own ideal


of unity and power, and by the most forcible argument and most eloquent appeal wrought the sentiment of the Convention to the standard of the present Constitution.

Hamilton now labored for its adoption. With Madison and Jay he issued the "Federalist," and, as its ablest expounder, explained its character and secured its acceptance by the people. But the work of Hamilton was not yet complete. The government must be put into successful operation. Washington appreciated the eminent talents of Hamilton and appointed him Secretary of the Treasury. This was the most responsible office under the new government. During the Revolution a heavy debt had been incurred. Business was paralyzed and the nation was upon the brink of bankruptcy. To restore the public credit was a herculean task few could have accomplished. But Hamilton developed the hidden resources of the people, rescued the nation from the dishonor of repudiation, and laid broad and deep the foundations upon which has since been built the grand structure of our financial prosperity. In the conception, adoption, and early administration of the Constitution, the statesmanship of Alexander Hamilton is thus everywhere conspicuous.

The wisdom of Hamilton's philosophy has vindicated itself. Under the influence which his spirit has imparted to its institutions, the country has for eighty-one years advanced in a career of unparalleled prosperity. To-day too in the hour of national trial, the vigor, which it was at once the object and fruition of Hamilton's statesmanship to infuse into the

Constitution, is the element of strength which will enable it to survive the attacks of a giant rebellion and to perpetuate the national honor, integrity, and power.

2





ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS AN EXPOUNDER OF THE CONSTITUTION.

BY HANNIBAL SMITH, '66.



THE American theory declares the end of government to be the protection of the individual in his inherent right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It recognizes the people as the creative power; they ordain the organic law by which their rulers are controlled.

The Constitution is to the government what the channel is to the river. If the river neither overflows nor breaks through its banks, commerce will ride upon its bosom, flourishing cities will adorn its borders, and prosperity will crown the scene; but if it swells into an irresistible torrent and overflows its banks, ruined cities and desolation will sadden the prospect.

So if the government moves within the limits fixed by the Constitution, liberty will be secure; but if it disregards those limits, anarchy or despotism will result.

A manifest violation of the Constitution is not probable ; but an unwarrantable interpretation may be equally subversive.

The danger of an erroneous exposition of the American Constitution is great ; for it is not based upon a simple theory, but upon a compound system. It is partly national and partly federal. If what is federal be disregarded, the tendency will be to total consolidation ; if what is national be overlooked, the Constitution will be transformed into a league between independent sovereignties and secession will erect a constitutional protection for its destructive work.

Hamilton stands first in time and preeminent in ability among the expounders of our national Constitution. The time and circumstances in which he expounded it, give to his exposition the importance and authority even of a judicial interpretation.

The Constitution did not entirely fulfil his conditions of a perfect one, because he preferred one in which every department of the government depends directly upon the people. He desired a constitution conformable to the national theory only.

All who favored the establishment of an energetic national government, advocated the ratification of the Constitution as the best that could be obtained. All who favored a federal league in which the sovereignty of each State would remain intact, opposed its adoption. Hamilton expounded the Constitution as an advocate for its ratification ; hence, his bias for what is national in theory was counter-balanced by his policy as an advocate. Consequently,

in his exposition every provision of the Constitution is exhibited in its true light and carried to its logical conclusion.

Hamilton expounded the Constitution to be the fundamental law. This, together with his theory of the nature of the relation which the Constitution created between the people of the several States, is the distinguishing principle of his exposition.

The nature of the relation established by the Constitution between the people of the several States is, in the light of recent events, of the most vital importance. If the Constitution be only a league between independent sovereignties, then the Southern people who attempted to deface our national banner committed no treason; the States may have violated their plighted faith, but their citizens would be shielded from punishment under the ægis of State nationality. If the American people by ratifying the Constitution only acceded to a league, our national structure is built upon sand; the strength and renown of American nationality, celebrated in every clime, are without solid foundation.

Happily for America! happily for mankind! Hamilton has placed this question beyond dispute.

Though he deemed it a gross heresy to maintain that a party to a compact has a right to revoke that compact, yet he declared that the possibility of a question of this nature proves the necessity of laying the foundation of our national government deeper than in the mere sanction of delegated authority. He proclaimed that the fabric of Ameri-

can empire rests on the solid basis of the consent of the people, and that the streams of national power flow immediately from that pure original fountain of all legitimate authority.

Hamilton maintained that the Constitution, once established, was irrevocable; and that the government could be overthrown by successful revolution only.

According to his exposition the establishment of the general government created American nationality; he, who before was a citizen of New York only, became an American citizen.

The argument by which Hamilton reached this conclusion is convincing. It is based upon an acknowledged truth. His syllogism is complete. The people are the original source of all legitimate authority. The powers requisite to constitute sovereignty are delegated by the people. The national and paramount sovereignty they delegated to the general government. Local sovereignty, when not inconsistent with the national, they delegated to the State governments. Consequently, the Constitution endows the national government with absolute sovereignty over the objects the American people confided to its care.

Can it be doubted that Hamilton expounded this fundamental principle of the Constitution correctly?

The structure and the operations of the government itself prove that he was correct; for, if the national government be not sovereign over the objects entrusted to it, the States must be. If the States be sovereign, then our national system is a

mere confederation; but it is not a confederation proper. The distinctive characteristics of a confederate system are the equality of the sovereignties of which it is composed, and the execution of the confederate enactments, not upon individuals, but upon the States in their corporate capacity. But in the American system the States have not an equal voice in the national councils, and the laws of the national government are executed, not upon States, but upon individuals.

The friends and the opponents of the Constitution, before its adoption, equally declare that Hamilton was correct. Patrick Henry opposed the ratification of the Constitution, because it would abridge the sovereignty of Virginia, and after the ratification he maintained that a State is no more to the nation than a county to the State.

Hamilton demonstrated clearly the necessity of the provisions of the Constitution whereby the government is empowered to regulate in the last resort the election of its own officers.

The right of the government to regulate elections is essential to self-preservation; for if the election of its own officers depend upon preestablished bodies, these bodies have only to refuse to act to disrupt the government. All governments dependent upon preexisting organizations are intrinsically weak. Hamilton attributed this organic weakness to the mode only of electing Senators; but owing to the peculiar organization of the Senate, he did not consider this weakness serious.

He exhibited great sagacity in showing the neces-

sity of the constitutional provisions, which invest the government with unlimited means for the accomplishment of the objects of its institution. The circumstances, he asserted, that endanger the safety of a nation are infinite ; therefore, the means at the command of the government should be coextensive with all possible combinations of such circumstances.

Thus the Constitution as expounded by Hamilton not only gives the national government a strong soul, but strong organs by which that soul operates.

Statesmen even of commanding abilities might find ample provisions in the Constitution to ensure its stability and perpetuity ; but Hamilton saw an inherent weakness in our complex system. Above the horizon of the not distant future, he beheld a threatening cloud—the possible encroachment by the States upon the national authority.

Constitutional limitations he did not think strong enough to preserve equilibrium between the State and national governments. He saw in the history of nations the record of violated obligations. He knew that the monumental memorial, chiseled by Phidias to commemorate the deliverance of Greece, became the resting-place of the spirit of jealousy.

He knew that the Furies of crimination and re-crimination swarmed, even in the pass of Thermopylæ ; he knew that jealousy between rival states, springing even from such historic spots as these, involved in ruin the liberty and independence of Greece.

Hamilton apprehended that the States, because of

their immediate relation to the people, would be supported by them in encroaching upon the national authority. From this cause he predicted the disruption of the Union within thirty years. His prophecy has failed ; but let nullification and the Rebellion decide whether his apprehensions had any basis. He did not foresee the development in the American people of an intense spirit of nationality. He did not duly appreciate the fact that the present is the age of great nations ; and that the glow of patriotism, springing from the consciousness of belonging to one of the great nations, would overcome any weakness in our complex system. Our experience has proved that Hamilton correctly indicated the peculiar strength and peculiar weakness of the American system.

As an expounder of the Constitution he displayed a vivid conception of the vital principles and fundamental conditions of a good government, one combining efficiency with liberty.

As a writer upon political science European critics rank him higher than Aristotle, Burke, or Montesquieu. America recognizes his preeminence ; and through the fiery ordeal of war has discovered that his theory of the Constitution is the only one compatible with national liberty and national prosperity. Secession evinces his foresight ; our national triumphs were made possible by his wisdom.

The great facts of American history combine to prove him a statesman of unrivaled genius.



THE INTELLECTUAL RANK OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AMONG HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

BY AMORY H. BRADFORD, '67.



AMERICAN art has few works which surpass Daniel Huntington's painting of "The Republican Court," or "Lady Washington's Reception Day." Washington is the centre of the picture. Around him are seen the philosophic head of Jefferson; the stern, strong features of the elder Adams; the genial countenance of Madison; and the clear, thoughtful, classical face of Hamilton. Ours it is, selecting from that group one of its brightest ornaments, to seek to determine, in the clear light of history, his true intellectual rank among his contemporaries.

The amount and quality of intellectual work which a man performs measures his intellectual power. The amount and quality of mental labor performed by one man compared with that accomplished by others, determines his relative intellectual rank. By what a mind does accomplish must be determined what it may do.

Alexander Hamilton was nature's favorite. Quick, penetrating, active, he had an intuitive knowledge of the duties required for any position. He was original and creative by nature; he was thorough and exhaustive in research. No subject too profound; no problem too intricate for him. The beauties of chastened imagery adorned his reasoning; yet it was clear, logical, and convincing. Strength and beauty combined and gave to it a strange power. He entered, examined, exhausted one sphere of thought after another in quick succession. He rose higher, delved deeper than other men; grasped firmly sublimer principles of government; studied, examined, lived with them until they became a part of himself. Then he wrote them out for the world. To-day the works of Alexander Hamilton are more extensive than any ancient or modern statesman, Cicero only excepted. And this was accomplished, not by a man of leisure, but by one who bore the brunt of unequal strife. His political philosophy, profound as the world has known, was written by the camp-fire's glare in the midnight bivouac. The undaunted political leader was the dauntless revolutionary soldier.

Alexander Hamilton was intellectually superior to all his American contemporaries. His achievements demonstrate it; their acknowledgments establish it. He was the most influential framer of the Federal Constitution. He conceived its plan and matured its form. A great historian of civilization has written, "There is not in the Constitution of the United States an element of order, of force,

of duration which Hamilton has not powerfully contributed to introduce into it and to cause to predominate." Yet Pinckney and Morris were in the Convention; Franklin and Madison were there. Now the simple fact that Hamilton was allowed to contribute so much to the Constitution of the United States proves that, by common consent, he was the leader of the Convention which framed it.

After the Constitution had been adopted the power of the government must be respected; its laws executed. This required means. Whence were they to come? When the Constitution was framed the example of other nations could be followed. But what model could guide him who was to manage the finances of the new-born Republic? History was silent. He could not follow. He must create. What was the Treasury of the United States at that time? A mere figment of the imagination. The United States had no money, scarcely any credit; no system for gaining a revenue. The national debt was unpaid; its amount unknown. Out of nothing Hamilton provided for past indebtedness and present demands. There was nothing, yet under Hamilton's management our financial system became almost perfect. Million-handed industry started into action. Commerce revived, spread her wings over every sea; an abundant revenue filled the coffers of the nation. Hope crowded away despair. Health and prosperity began to throb through the arteries of national life. In the eloquent words of the Constitution's greatest champion, "He touched the dead corpse of the Public

Credit and it sprang upon its feet"; not "with the feeble, spasmodic life of a galvanized body, but the life of a strong, graceful, irresistible giant."

This was confessedly the most difficult office in the new government. It was impossible to determine by experience for what positions men were best adapted. Hence if the appointing powers had not considered Hamilton the ablest man in the nation, would they, could they as patriots have chosen him to perform the most difficult task?

But, for Alexander Hamilton the matchless political essayist, has Fame woven her fairest garlands. The "Federalist," the proudest monument of his genius, is an embodiment of all that we now revere in the science of government. It is a masterpiece of political philosophy, the grandest exposition of our Constitution ever written. The mighty debates of Calhoun and Webster are its acknowledged inferiors. It takes its historic place beside the "Letters of Junius," Montesquieu's "Spirit of the Laws," and Burke's immortal "Reflections." Is this exaggerated? Then Guizot, the most philosophic historian of the age, is an exaggerator. He said, "In the application of elementary principles of government to practical administration, it is the greatest work known to me." Exaggerated! Then Chancellor Kent was an exaggerator, for he wrote, "I know not of any work on the principles of free government that is to be compared in instruction and in intrinsic merit to the 'Federalist.'"

His intellectual superiority over all his American contemporaries is perfectly manifest. Who can be

compared with him? The "Sage of Monticello" alone. Gratitude has almost apotheosized Thomas Jefferson; gratitude because he prepared the paper which declared our independence. But deserved gratitude is not a measure of intellectual power. Place Jefferson and Hamilton together. The former is more literary, more refined, more popular; the latter more practical, discerning, and controlling. Jefferson could prepare reports requiring the most exhaustive research, digest laws, follow the intricate mazes of international diplomacy as perhaps no other man of his time. But could he have created from the barren soil of '89 the beautiful fabric of our national credit? He could write the Declaration; could he have evolved a constitution? A political writer of undoubted preeminence he never did, never could have composed anything equal to the statesmanlike arguments of "Pacificus" or the irresistible logic of the "Federalist." Yet his efforts for liberty were glorious efforts; his patriotism unsullied as the cause he advocated; his splendid fame lasting as the land he loved. Others were superior in particular departments. Adams was peerless as a Senatorial leader; Henry, matchless in fervid oratory; Morris, equal perhaps as a financier; but in the combination of those powers which make the comprehensive, philosophic, and practical intellect, Alexander Hamilton stood alone.

Again, if we imagine him in France, amid the splendor of the court of Louis XVI.; in England, when Parliament was an assemblage of giants, would his glory wane? With Necker as the representative

of French intellect ; with Burke as the exponent of the English mind when England's mental superiority was her national glory ; by the side of these we place him, and proudly ask again does his glory wane ? Necker's task as a financier might have been greater ; was it more successfully performed ? Besides, Necker was great only in the cabinet. As a financier, he stands the greatest in French history ; perhaps in the world's history. But this was all. No orator, an inferior writer, a narrow-minded, vacillating statesman ; who can believe him intellectually equal to the practical legislator, the accomplished financier, and the profound political philosopher of America ?

No age has produced two greater minds than Alexander Hamilton and Edmund Burke. To each was given a wider combination of powers than to any other public men of their time. Was Burke endowed with an understanding " penetrating, energetic, comprehensive, and profound " ? So was Hamilton. Was Burke's fancy " vivid, versatile, all-embracing " ? Hamilton's was not less so. Burke was a more extensive miscellaneous writer ; Hamilton, his equal as a political essayist. Burke was a more perfect orator and profound philosopher ; Hamilton, a more practical thinker and philosophic statesman. In the realm of polite letters Burke was an acknowledged master. This Hamilton never entered. Burke united the profound thought of the philosopher, the recondite erudition of the scholar, the clear foresight of the statesman, the magnetic power of the orator, with the polished culture and classic

elegance of the literary connoisseur. The age demanded greater things of Hamilton. The American revolutionist gained a different culture from the English scholar. Proudly, then, I claim that the greatest American intellect of the eighteenth century was inferior to the greatest British only in the broad range of his literary accomplishments.

Candid comparison and impartial history have placed the intellectual rank of Alexander Hamilton above all American contemporaries; above all French; and I sincerely believe above all English but one, second only to Edmund Burke.

Statesman, financier, philosopher; pride of the bar and ornament of the forum; dauntless in battle as stainless in patriotism; cosavior of his country and glory of the nation, stands the name of Hamilton in the history of America. Every day his fame grows brighter. Experience proves his wisdom and destroys enmity. The Union united, once more and forever, in a glorious brotherhood is the proud memorial of his intellectual power. His teachings, stretching from the great Revolution to the great Rebellion, preserved the Republic. They were incarnated in that army that swept armed treason from power; that moved in a splendid triumphal march from western valley to eastern seaboard; and with Grant at its head, and loyalty to right for its motto, "bound the nation as it unbound the slave." Years may pass before the Muse of history shall open her tablets to record a name more enduring than his. Centuries may elapse before Providence shall bestow upon America another Alexander Hamilton.



ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS A POLITICAL PROPHET.

BY JOHN D. HENDERSON, '68.



IN passing judgment upon the political foresight of any man, we must consider, not merely the speeches delivered in partisan debate, but his entire political career; we must ask, what were the principles which he professed, what was the effect of the measures which he advocated or opposed?

Political foresight is a necessary element of statesmanship, and deeds prophesy more than words. The wise man looks forward to results; the foolish man sees only the present. Curtis has said that "Alexander Hamilton seems to have been born a statesman. At the age of twenty-three he had already formed well-defined, profound, and comprehensive opinions on the situation and wants of the confederated States. He had wrought for himself a political system far in advance of the conceptions of his contemporaries."

For nearly thirty years Mr. Hamilton was in the public service, and before the people as a political

man. His writings are extensive and voluminous, and his opinions are clearly expressed upon all the great questions which at that time agitated and divided the nation. As the original projector and earnest advocate of the Constitution, we find him the principal author of the "Federalist." As the first Secretary of the Treasury, he directed the financial affairs of the government, and placed upon a firm basis the credit of the nation. As head, heart, and soul of the Federal party, he exerted all his influence against the combined power of Thomas Jefferson, Aaron Burr, James Madison, and that host of intellectual giants of the opposite school who flourished during his time, until finally, he went down before the resistless current of popular sentiment.

It may be said that Mr. Hamilton had too little faith in the capacity of the people for self-government. His real error was his low estimate of public opinion. He did not consider that ours had been practically a government of the people ever since the landing of the Pilgrims upon these shores. "He was no theorist; his powers were eminently practical."

The system of republican government was something for which history furnished no precedent. Did Hamilton think that the experiment would fail? I believe that he expected it would fail. Still he considered the new form better than the old. He would have given greater power to the central government. He would have had a Senate and a President for life. He would have merged the States in the

nation, but he would have saved the nation. He foresaw, what has since been so clearly demonstrated, that there was more to be apprehended from the resistance of the States to federal power than in executive usurpation.

The Constitution did not meet his views; he thought that there was too little security against factions. But Mr. Hamilton's chief merit was in making the best of the circumstances by which he was surrounded. His articles in the "Federalist" furnish the most clear, luminous, and comprehensive exposition of our system of government that has ever been published in America. Every argument of those who opposed the Constitution is taken up in detail, and refuted. Every department of the proposed government is carefully examined, and the practical workings of the system are foretold with wonderful accuracy.

It is not possible to suppose that any man of those times had a clear conception of the greatness of the nation's future. The old Confederation had proved a failure, and well might the founders of the new government fear for *its* success. Hamilton himself spoke of it as an experiment. He believed that crises would arise when it would be necessary to strengthen the general government and put an end forever to the doctrine of State rights, which was then so persistently advocated.

Of the famous Virginia Resolutions of 1790, he said, "It was the first symptom of a spirit which must either be killed or it will kill the nation." Has not the history of secession, founded upon those

very resolutions, proved the correctness of this prophecy?

Although we may not believe that Hamilton's plan of a stronger government was wise, still we must be convinced that he foresaw the difficulties which might arise, and did all in his power to ward off the danger. It was well that the first trial of the new system was in the hands of its friends. Great as was the merit of Washington's administration, much in plan, much in execution, must devolve upon Hamilton. It was a hard struggle to inaugurate Hamilton's financial system, but it was a grand success; and Washington himself says that "it would have been impossible to have foretold the unexampled prosperity of the country."

How much of the Farewell Address was the production of Hamilton we cannot say; but of this much we are certain, that no inconsiderable portion of that famous document owes its origin to the confidential friend and adviser of the great Virginian. Can any one deny that his views are expressed throughout the address? The earnest desire that everything might become national; the patriotic hope that the bonds of unity and mutual sympathy between the States might be strengthened; the prophetic warnings against geographical parties and foreign alliances; all these indicate that the hand of Hamilton penned the address, the mind of Hamilton conceived it.

It is charged that Mr. Hamilton sympathized with England. But he was not a monarchist. It is difficult to say what was his opinion of the English

government. I think that he expected our government would assimilate to the British form, and that our President, although elective, would become something like the English king. It is certain that he looked with very little favor upon the excesses of the French revolutionists; and when our country came so near to a war with France in 1799, he endeavored to precipitate the event. This policy seemed necessary to counteract the sympathy among our people for the French Republic, and the desire, which a few years before had been widespread, for the interference of our government in the European wars. Besides, Hamilton was a military man, and when the acts of France became so oppressive as to arouse the indignation of the American people, he foresaw the great preponderance which it would give the Federal party to awaken the patriotic feeling of the nation, and the opportunities it would afford for his own personal glory.

But Hamilton was not infallible, and as a politician he made some great mistakes. His course in the election of 1800 tended to divide the Federal party. I do not believe that he was sincere when he prophesied that the election of Jefferson would ruin the nation. If he was, his pamphlet, entitled "A Review of the Administration of John Adams," shows a sad lack of foresight and a want of tact as a political leader. The contest was a close one; a few votes would have turned the scale. Aaron Burr saw the divisions among the Federalists; secured Hamilton's pamphlet and published it to the world. The Democrats carried the election, and never after

was the prestige of the old regime sufficient to restore the Federal party to power.

Another great error of Hamilton's political career was his attempt, after the preliminary election, to pervert the incorruptible mind of John Jay, in order to defeat Mr. Jefferson. Governor Jay refused to call an extra session of the legislature to change the law in regard to electors, and condemned the movement as unworthy the consideration of an honest man. After the election, Hamilton's influence in national politics began to wane; but he was still a great man, and might possibly have resumed his position in the affairs of the nation had not the tragic event at Weehawken terminated his brilliant career.

What then shall we say of Hamilton? His friends have given him unqualified praise. His enemies have belied his name. If he had too little confidence in the judgment of the people, he was ever watchful for their rights and liberty. If he desired a strong central government, it was that his country might have a name and a history. If he spoke at times despondingly of the nation's future, he always worked to make that future glorious.

No man has ever held fewer offices within the gift of the American people, and at the same time exercised a greater influence in the government. Some of the measures which he advocated have proved of the greatest utility, but he sometimes allowed his partisan feelings to overcome his own good sense. His life gives evidence of the profoundest statesmanship; but the principles he professed were soon condemned by the people. His

great political foresight no man can deny, but as a party leader he made some of the worst blunders in the history of politics. His untimely death was a severe blow to the nation, and the name of his enemy has justly been made synonymous with infamy.

But Hamilton needs no eulogy ; and that familiar couplet of one of England's greatest poets is peculiarly applicable to him :

“ Search ye the land of living men
Where shall we find his like again ? ”





THE RELATIONS OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND AARON BURR.

BY CHARLES H. SEARLE, '69.



THE period in which Hamilton and Burr were contemporaries was perhaps the most eventful in American history. Beginning with the first resistance to British domination, it embraced the eight years' struggle, the trials and dissensions under the Confederation, and the rise and opening career of our constitutional government. From the respective relations of Hamilton and Burr to the events of this period, grew up many of their relations to each other. These relations began in the army; were continued at the bar and in politics; and terminated in a fatal encounter.

At the first outbreak of war with the mother country, Hamilton and Burr quitted their books and joined the patriot army. They were both young, brave, ardent; and both ambitious for distinction. But in the army they did not compete for the rewards of heroism; nor were the achievements of the one weighed against those of the other.

Their rivalry was of a peculiar nature. It consisted in the impressions they were each making on the mind of Washington. This keen and impartial observer said that both young men possessed pre-eminent abilities. But what was more important, in Hamilton he saw these abilities consecrated to noble aims; in Burr, to the service of a selfish and unscrupulous ambition. As the result of these opinions, he made Hamilton Secretary of the Treasury in 1789; and ten years later, called him to the second office in the army. On the other hand, from motives of duty equally well founded, he refused to appoint Burr minister to France, 1794; and in 1799, prevented his obtaining a commission in the army.

When Burr received these disappointments he had long regarded Hamilton as his most formidable opponent. It is not strange, therefore, that he should have attributed his repulses, not so much to the distrust of Washington, as to the hostile agency of his rival. This suspicion took the force of actual fact and sunk deep into his heart.

As lawyers, Hamilton and Burr contended more than twenty years for the supremacy. In this earnest competition, they each became thoroughly acquainted with the character and motives of the other. This fact gives to their rivalry at the bar its chief importance. It was here that Hamilton acquired that distrust of Burr which gave such intensity to his subsequent political opposition. Here, also, Burr first felt not only the towering preeminence of Hamilton's genius, but the repellent force of his antagonism.

But the relations of these men first became really important and of national interest when they entered the arena of politics. As prominent members of rival parties they were necessarily opposed. Hamilton's opposition to Burr, however, rose above partisan grounds; and was peculiar, intense, and aggressive. It is important that we appreciate correctly this opposition of Hamilton, the reasons that prompted it, its nature, and its results.

Hamilton opposed Burr, first, because he believed him to be a man of restless and unscrupulous ambition. In this opinion he was fortified, not only by the observations of a long acquaintance and intercourse, but by the assenting judgment of Washington. The ascendancy of such a man, he believed, should ever be dreaded in a republic. In the condition of our government and people at that time, he found other cause for dreading Burr's political elevation. The nation was entering upon a new and untried career. It was burdened with debt, beset by the dangers of internal dissensions, and exposed to jealousy and hatred from abroad. At such a time it was supremely important that the officers of government should not only be men of great abilities, but of great virtues. That same patriotic purpose that had prompted Hamilton to such untiring efforts in adding to the solidity and permanence of the government, now urged him to guard it against the arts of the demagogue.

But how should he proceed? The man whose elevation to office he so sincerely dreaded was no patient plodder, satisfied with small rewards, but his

ambition pointed to the highest positions, and his career was ever upward. For Hamilton to reveal his opinions of this man's character to the people would be to expose his life to the resentment of a bold and determined antagonist. On the other hand, if he permitted Burr to advance unopposed to power, who would protect the government against the encroachments of ambition? Between these two dangers circumstances seemed to provide a middle course. It happened that Burr, in the most important crisis of his career, depended upon the Federalists for aid. Hamilton's great influence with this party made his opposition easy, effective, and apparently safe. He had only to communicate his distrust in confidence, and to trusted friends, and the effect was immediate and satisfactory.

The results of these private assaults upon Burr are mainly seen in three important elections.

In 1792, Burr's friends wished to make him governor of New York. If an alliance with the Federalists could be obtained their success was assured. The Federal purpose vacillated. Hamilton, throwing his influence into the scale, prevented this alliance, and thus gave Burr his first great repulse.

In 1800, Jefferson and Burr had obtained an equal number of electoral votes, and the election of President devolved upon the House of Representatives. The moment of final decision Hamilton believed would be one of supreme interest to the life of the nation. Though the Federalists were all turning to Burr, and though Jefferson had ever been his bitterest enemy, he yielded neither to partisan aspirations

nor to the promptings of enmity, but with a fervid earnestness and a convincing logic urged upon his friends the necessity of Jefferson's election. When the long exciting conflict was over Burr had been beaten, and in producing this result no other man had contributed so much either of influence or labor as Hamilton.

Four years later the contest is again in New York. Burr, having lost prestige with his party, runs as independent candidate for governor. The Federalists, ready to adopt any expedient to regain power, rally to his support. But again Hamilton stands in the way and utters his earnest remonstrance. He denounces every proposition of alliance with such a man for any purpose, as futile, dishonorable, and dangerous. The party that has so long looked to him as its wisest leader wavers and turns back. Once more the hopes of Aaron Burr are dashed to the ground, and again his most powerful opponent is Alexander Hamilton.

These were no ordinary disappointments. To understand their effect upon Burr, we must remember that power was the great controlling aim of his life. For this he manœuvred and intrigued. To obtain this he was equally ready to prey upon his country's weakness and to brave its power. How long then would a single human life oppose an obstacle in his way? Cool, courageous, and sure in his aim, if he could only bring his enemy to face him his object was secured. In all his important repulses he had felt and recognized Hamilton's agency, yet he had found no sufficient cause for a quarrel. But

now recent disappointment and present prospects made him desperate. To such a temper a pretext for a challenge could not long be wanting. Catching at the merest glimpse of a private conversation, indiscreetly revealed, in which Hamilton had expressed distrust of him, he made it the basis of demands so extraordinary and insulting as to shut up every avenue of peaceable settlement. Earnestly, patiently, did Hamilton seek to avoid an encounter, but against these humiliating exactions his proud nature rebelled. And with the dignity of a soldier he accepted the dread alternative.

On a beautiful morning in July, 1804, upon a wild and secluded spot on the Hudson, Hamilton and Burr confronted each other for the deadly conflict. They were sustained by a purpose deliberate and steadfast; but a purpose, how different. Hatred and murder were in Burr's heart; in Hamilton's, mercy and charity. Burr had come thither to remove a powerful enemy, and open the way to power; Hamilton, to purchase at the risk of his life the ability to be in the future useful to his country. For a moment they stood there in the bright, peaceful morning, full of life and hope and promise; on the next Hamilton fell in the swoon of death, and his destroyer, with the burden of his guilty and fatal triumph, hurried away.

Thus sadly terminated the relations of Hamilton and Burr. Amid the sobs of the nation whose thought and action he had done so much to shape, the fallen statesman was borne to his grave; cut down in the very midday of his use-

fulness, he left an unfinished career, grand in its promise ; and in its possibilities almost limitless. Sorrowing for his fate, the country awoke to a new and truer appreciation of his services. Praise, hitherto silent, took voice when he was gone, and his fame shot up the sky, resplendent like a star.

Very different, but not less fatal, were the effects of the duel upon Burr. Like a resistless torrent, popular condemnation burst upon him, bearing him farther and farther from power, to new excesses and greater shame.

From that fatal field he wandered forth "a fugitive, a vagabond among his kind." For thirty restless, weary years, he dragged out a profitless existence, witnessing every day to the bitter end something to remind him of his own disgrace and the fadeless glory of Hamilton.





OUR POLITICAL INDEBTEDNESS TO ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

BY THOMAS H. ABBOTT, '70.



HE 5th of August, 1788, was a gala day in the city of New York. Her people had assembled to celebrate their State's adoption of the Constitution; and to honor their greatest statesman. Anticipating the result of history, they represented him as, next to Washington, most worthy of popular esteem. It is our purpose to glance at our nation's history; and from it show our political indebtedness to Alexander Hamilton. An early business training, and an acquaintance with the principles of political economy, well fitted him for the life of a financier. He had already the title, "Founder of the Public Credit," when he was chosen to the most important position in Washington's cabinet. He was expected to restore public credit, create a revenue, reanimate industry, and provide for the financial future of the country. His first measure was to declare that the nation's honor demanded the pay-

ment of the public debt. To accomplish this, he proposed successively a funding system, the assumption of State debts, and a national bank. The country responded to the slightest touch of so great a master. "Abundant streams of revenue" welled up from the internal reservoir of national resources. Government securities touched par, and rose to a premium, bearing with them the credit of the country.

Augustus Cæsar boasted that he had found Rome of brick, and left it marble; Hamilton did more. He found a currency of paper, and made it gold. He saw trade and commerce stagnant, and stirred up their waters to unwonted purity. He looked upon a country bankrupt, and it became prosperous.

It is not for past prosperity only, that we are indebted to Hamilton. To-day, with a credit and prosperity the wonder of Europe; with a large assumption of State debts, we are reaping the advantages of the funding system. National banks, with the aid they have afforded the country, still promote industry; and wherever the stars and stripes float in unsullied purity, the American people reecho the doctrine of Hamilton: No compromise of the nation's honor; no repudiation.

Our greatest debt is to Hamilton the statesman. Here, too, we find him qualified for his position. He had received a liberal education; was well read in the principles of law; and had studied with special care the political history of all nations. Before his entrance into political life he had learned, from experience as a soldier, the truths taught by Greece,

by Rome, and by England. Lack of form in the general government had ever been the defect of the early confederations. From the Declaration of Independence, until the adoption of the Constitution, the colonies had been thirteen independent States, with no common arbiter. They were held together by external pressure, rather than inherent force. At the best, they were only war governments; and the peace of '83 had left State obligations paramount. With this monster of State rights, Hamilton's life was a continual struggle. He was too thorough a student of history to doubt for a moment the failure of any government that did not acknowledge a supreme head. He knew that the centrifugal force of State governments must be held in check by the centripetal force of national government. As author of the "Continentalist," and as member of the Annapolis and Philadelphia conventions, he urged the adoption of these views, until they were engrafted into the Constitution. While taking a less active part in the Constitutional Convention than many others, Hamilton contended stoutly for a strong central government; and was the author of the system of suffrage that remained for so many years. Of his labors in the Convention, Guizot says, "There is not an element of order, strength, and duration in the Constitution, which he did not powerfully contribute to place there." The framing of the Constitution was but half the work; it must be adopted by the States. Here it is that the choicest laurels have been woven for Hamilton. He has been called "the chief framer of the Con-

stitution"; far more was he its great advocate before the people. The chief contributor to the "Federalist," that work will always remain his great monument. Eighty years have seen it without an equal as a commentary on the Constitution.

It was the lever resting on the fulcrum of the people's common sense, that moved the States, one by one, to their position in the Union. Above everything else, it was the one thing that secured the adoption of the Constitution. From the "Federalist" sprang constitutional law; and the majesty and beauty of the edifice bear witness to the wisdom of its founder. Afterwards, in the convention of New York, Hamilton emphasized with his voice the teachings of his pen; and to him we are indebted for the eleventh-hour entrance of this State into the Union. Such is Hamilton's record as a statesman; it is the unbalanced page of our political indebtedness to him.

What do we of to-day owe Hamilton? Were his principles mere stepping-stones, that have been pushed aside in our progress in the nineteenth century?

The war of 1812 was the first great strain upon the new Constitution; and it proved that a strong central government was no less fitted for war than for peace. The former government had likewise coped successfully with a foreign foe; would the new government prove their superior in domestic dissensions? This was the issue of '32. The nullification acts of South Carolina sprang from the long buried New Jersey plan; what had defeated it in '87, defeated it

again half a century afterwards. Andrew Jackson certainly had little sympathy with the Federalists ; yet his proclamation was what ? An embodiment of the principles of Alexander Hamilton. Thus was the country proved to be strong from within. Nearly thirty years later State rights fired upon United States rights. In itself it was a little thing ; yet the loyal North flew to arms. Those who looked on the surface said it was the attack on Sumter that armed the nation. And so it was ; but beneath this surface was the influence of Federalist teachings, derived from Magna Charta. For seventy years these teachings had moulded the belief that killed secession. Men who looked deeper, said the warnings of Daniel Webster had saved the Union. These philosophers forgot that the great defender of the Constitution, even in his noblest utterances, was only the disciple of a greater master. They forgot that even Webster's eloquence would have been of none effect without supreme power in the national government. Abraham Lincoln gave freedom to the slave ; but Lincoln would have been powerless, unless the government had been supreme. Before the century had been born, was sown the seed that bore such golden fruit. Do we detract from the honor of Webster and Lincoln, and their brave allies in the course of freedom ? Far from it. Principles, not men, govern America ; and we shall ever honor the leaders in our country's freedom, as we honor Luther and Calvin, and our leaders in religious freedom.


Grant may have marshaled the armies of the Re-

public ; Sherman, and Thomas, and Sheridan may have led her troops to victory ; Farragut, and Foote, and Porter may have cleared the river and the ocean of her enemies ; but to none of these belongs the victory.

The true surrender beneath the Appomattox apple-tree was of State government to national government. History repeats itself ; the surrender of theories in 1787 finds its counterpart in the surrender of armies in 1865. Have we stripped the bays from living heroes, that we might strew them on the graves of buried greatness ? Have we denied our other benefactors, that we might do greater honor to Hamilton ? No ! a thousand times no ! Hamilton was only one of that mighty host which sprang forth, armed and equipped for the country's defense. Men are but the instruments of God, we know ; yet we believe that next to those two who have saved the nation, stands the one whose principles have been its strongest bulwark.

We then, of the nineteenth century, and citizens of these United States, stand triply indebted to Hamilton, for that organizing power which saved the country from financial ruin ; for the supremacy of the national government, that has protected it from foes abroad and enemies at home ; and, above all, for the adoption of the Constitution, thus securing to us the blessings of civil and religious freedom. As to-day we rest secure beneath the ægis of the Constitution ; as we see a people of forty millions, prosperous and happy ; as we behold monarchies vanishing, and nations standing on the threshold of

free government ; let us, looking below the surface, remember and most gratefully and emphatically acknowledge our indebtedness to Alexander Hamilton.





ALEXANDER HAMILTON COMPARED WITH HIS EUROPEAN CONTEMPORARIES.

BY JAMES L. BENNETT, '71.



ALEXANDER HAMILTON ranks first among his American contemporaries as a lawyer, financier, and politician. These three qualities unite to form the accomplished statesman. It is our purpose to compare him, in these particulars, with the representative men of Europe and to ascertain his relative rank among them. We shall confine our inquiry to France and England as the nations representing the best fields for comparison.

The United States, emerging from a condition of dependency on the mother country, bearing aloft her liberal and progressive ideas, without experience, without law, torn by conflicting opinions and sectional prejudices, was about to enter upon the difficult task of forming an original government. The people could, indeed, be guided by the great principles of popular sovereignty, principles taught them no less by the experience of history than by

the instincts of nature; but how best to apply them in the construction of a government was the problem to be solved by the American statesman. The authorship of these cardinal principles no one can claim. They came, the spontaneous outbreak of long, pent-up desires, fired by the oppression of the mother country. To direct the minds of this overjoyous people in their proper channel, to engraft the principles they cherished in the laws by which they were to be governed, was the task to which Hamilton devoted himself. Such was his mission; such were the difficulties against which he contended.

The French and American revolutions, the forming of the empire in India, and the varied successes of the English flag in every land rendered this the most complex and interesting period of English, as well as American history. It was adorned by an array of talent that finds no parallel. Fox, Burke, and Pitt were men, any one of whom would have rescued an age from oblivion.

The condition of France was well-nigh indescribable. The people for ages had been oppressed by unrelenting tyranny. They imagined that at last they saw the dawn of freedom, and they yielded to no check in their unbounded enthusiasm. The commanding spirits of Danton, Mirabeau, and Talleyrand arose and disappeared amid the tumult, leaving behind them no trace but of blood.

Such was the condition of these countries when Necker appeared in France, Erskine and Pitt in England, and Hamilton in the United States.

Lord Erskine in many respects resembled Hamilton. As lawyers, both men base their claims to public approval on higher grounds than the simple effort for their client's success. Both dazzled the legal world at their first appearance, and assumed, at once, high rank as constitutional lawyers. But their motives were different. One worked for reputation and made his profession the controlling object in life ; with the other it was secondary to a higher aim, the establishment of the Constitution and the credit of the nation. Yet the power of Erskine's eloquence was often felt in the defense of the same principles for which Hamilton contended. He raised his voice for liberty of speech and the press, and the people became intelligent. He spoke against the tremendous doctrine of constructive treason, and Englishmen felt their lives secure. Wielding the eloquence of Burke and Fox, he was the most accomplished advocate of his time. His example to lawyers taught integrity and independence. The great lesson taught by Hamilton's experience, was that the highest legal attainments could be utilized with powerful effect, toward not only the integrity of law, but of government. Erskine used his power to bring about reform and hasten the progress of liberty ; Hamilton, to form a government and to place it on a sound legal basis. When we consider the ability against which he contended, the power of his eloquence and its wonderful effects, we are constrained to place Lord Erskine simply as a lawyer above all his contemporaries. In the broader light of a constitutional expounder, he finds his rival in Alexander

Hamilton. As a financier the comparison is most favorable to Hamilton. He was not, like Pitt, obliged to encounter the powerful opposition of the Fox and North coalition; nor like Necker to reconcile his plans to the totally irreconcilable elements of the nobility and the maddened populace. But he could not, like them, profit by the experience of others. Our nation possesses sources inexhaustible but unknown. It was his to discover and develop them. The nation, in its infancy, shaken by discordant elements, forced by logic and circumstances to accept a constitution to which a majority were opposed, denied the constitutionality of the necessary measures. Hamilton's task, therefore, began back of his appointment as Secretary of the Treasury. In the Convention it was his sagacity which produced a financial system. In the "Federalist" it was his eloquence which convinced the people that these measures were just. Having thus established the basis of a sound financial system, wisdom dictated, alike to President, Congress, and the people, that Hamilton was the only man to conduct the Treasury. Necker, by his own conceit, raised himself to an unmerited reputation. Lacking Hamilton's sagacity, he failed to conceive the difference between the French and English nations. He reduced the expenses of the government and effected loans sufficient for their immediate necessities. Considering the excitement of the hour, he could hardly have done more. We call him, like Hamilton, honest; like him, economical; unlike Hamilton, he was not able to comprehend all the circumstances of his position. He was a man of talent, but not of gen-

ius. Pitt, as a financier, is more worthy of consideration. He found the debt of England increasing to an alarming extent. By a system of judicious economy he corrected the evil. His immense armies demanded fresh supplies. Seeking for a remedy, he resorted to the old schemes of the Walpole ministry. He had the experience of the past to guide him. Let him have the credit of profiting by it. Hamilton found the Treasury empty, the nation bankrupt. He was obliged to invent a theory, prove its merits and constitutionality, and apply it successfully. He did it to the satisfaction of his constituents and the astonishment of the world. He came into office upon no false theory like Necker, nor did he rely for success on the revived theories of former financiers as did Pitt. The resources of his own great mind enabled him to comprehend the case in all its bearings. With prophetic knowledge he produced his plan; by untiring industry and matchless genius he insured its success. Hamilton in the originality, the execution, and the success of his schemes maintains, in history, the undoubted position of the best financier of his time.

As a politician and statesman the comparison is scarcely less favorable. As a lawyer simply, Erskine was fully his equal. As a financier he had no equal. As a politician and statesman his rivals are rare in any age. Upon principles of honesty and integrity he placed himself, and gave his record to posterity to be honored and emulated. There is but one to whom it is fitting to compare him. William Pitt added all the experience of history to his powerful intellect, and prepared himself for a most brilliant

future. He laid bare the corruptions of the ministry, and Fox and North were prostrate before him. His command went forth and the entire resources of England became available. He held them in his grasp, wielded the greatest powers of Europe, and the great aristocrat trembled on his throne.

France, whose idol was military glory, produced her Napoleon. His genius carried him beyond comparison. The two nations of the English tongue, whose objects and interests centred in peace, diplomacy, and statesmanship, rivaled each other in the careers of the two great statesmen, Pitt and Hamilton. Pitt's influence was international and momentary; Hamilton's was local, but can only be measured by the progress of liberal ideas.

Alexander Hamilton surpassed all his contemporaries in the originality and versatility of his genius, whether exercised in law, finance, or polity; yielding to Necker in nothing, to Erskine only in legal ability, to Pitt only in the iron strength of his purpose; as the great original genius of his age he had no superior. Danton, Robespierre, and Mirabeau passed from notice as mad fanatics without settled purpose. Fox, North, and Granville allowed partisan madness to rule over dictates of patriotism. As the greatest instrumentality in the origin of our government; as the ablest maker and expounder of our laws; as the one to whom alone the credit of our nation is due; as the scholar, the orator, the statesman, in that age of the world most distinguished for its brilliant intellects; the career of Hamilton dims the lustre of contemporary statesmen.



THE POSITION OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON IN AMERICAN HISTORY.

BY J. HENRY SHEPHERD, '72.



ON the 6th of September, 1774, the citizens of New York held a public meeting to consider the oppressive course of Parliament toward the colonies. Hired emissaries of the crown, scattered through the assemblage, sought to destroy its harmony.

A sophomore of King's College, having noticed that several points had been left untouched by the different speakers, came forward to address the people. At first his manner was hesitating, owing to the diffidence of youth, but soon the inspiration within him broke through every restraint, until he swayed the minds of his hearers with the force of the forest-born orator of Virginia. The clearness of his style, the depth of feeling with which he portrayed their wrongs, added to the most convincing persuasiveness, welded those at variance into a harmonious whole. In the same year, when the ablest Tories assailed Congress, when the people

began to waver in their march toward liberty, Hamilton grappled with the most vigorous champions of England, refuted their arguments, and well earned the title of "Vindicator of Congress."

The ability displayed in these controversies placed him among the foremost writers of the day. Through the long struggle, as confidential adviser and secretary of the commander-in-chief, he wielded the pen of the army. No man was more familiar with the embarrassments of the country, or more intimate with its resources. He aided alike in planning campaigns, preparing negotiations with foreign powers. Quick in seizing ideas, patient in working out details, rich in the resources of language, he was well fitted to interpret between Washington and the world. When darkness spread a gloom over the land, when five years of indecisive war had elapsed during the most chaotic confusion of finances, he projected a policy which restored the ruined credit, furnished new sinews of war, and fed the half-starved heroes of Trenton, Saratoga, and Valley Forge.

The success of his financial scheme led to the establishment of the national bank, which played such a conspicuous part towards the close of the Revolution and in the infancy of the Republic. Hamilton suggested the executive departments which introduced system and economy into the government and reduced the annual expenditure from \$20,000,000 to \$8,000,000.

During the last campaign of the war, Hamilton was elected to represent New York in Congress. Here he exerted a controlling influence. He was

chairman of its most important committees. The brightness of the victory of England was dimmed by a new cloud of danger. A deep murmur of discontent arose from the army because this had been neglected. Hamilton, sensible of their accumulated wrongs, pleaded their cause, nor did he cease his efforts until he wrung from Congress a fulfilment of the nation's obligations to these heroes.

He introduced the establishment of a national coinage, the placing of the army on a peace footing, and the creation of a navy. He planned treaties beneficial to commerce. He established the best revenue system the nation has ever had—a system which promoted frugality, taxed extravagance, and encouraged home industry. Although the duty was light, yet it filled an empty treasury, eased the burdens of taxation, and served as a security for a foreign loan.

He labored for an enlargement of the powers of Congress which was necessary for the efficient government of the States. While others sought compromises, between their love of popularity, and their sense of duty; while they combated for the interests of their States, Hamilton rose above sectionalism, and sought only to found a government which would perpetuate the hard-earned liberties. Alone he urged an act of oblivion and amnesty toward those who had aided the king. He pointed to the inconsistency between proscription and the principles of 1776. He drew up the final treaty between England and the United States.

After the adjournment of Congress, he began his

professional career. New York had passed the Trespass Act, and this conflicted with the treaty of peace. It asserted the State. It denied the right of the Confederation to make treaties binding on the States.

Hamilton's first effort was in the cause of national integrity. He denied the right of parties to sue for injuries committed during the war. Passion, prejudice, and sympathy for a poor widow were arrayed against him ; but his eloquence secured justice and the integrity of national faith.

The defects of the Confederation had prolonged the war, increased its expense, and after the peace threatened the disruption of the Union. Its treaties were disregarded by the States ; its calls for money ridiculed. Industry was paralyzed, trade annihilated, foreign navigation acts had driven our commerce from the seas. Foreign influence, the bane of popular institutions, was felt in the very halls of Congress. Anarchy was hurrying the nation into civil war, when Hamilton, a member of the New York legislature, introduced a resolution instructing Congress to call a national convention to provide a new constitution.

Violent opposition everywhere arose, especially in New York and Massachusetts, where the champions of State sovereignty wielded their greatest influence. It was with difficulty the States were prevailed upon to send delegates. New York sent Hamilton, Yates, and Lansing. The two latter were advocates of State rights, and cast their votes with Massachusetts against a strong federal government. The hostility

ended in their withdrawal from the Convention ; leaving New York without a voice in that body. Their party, intent on State aggrandizement, saw through the commercial advantages the future superiority of the Empire State.

In the early part of the session, Hamilton proposed a system of government which, although rejected, served as a basis of the general plan. He was a member of the committee which made the final draft. His labors may be well summed up in the language of Johnson, "If the Constitution did not succeed on trial, Hamilton was less responsible than any other member, for he fully pointed out the infirmities to which it was liable. If it answered the fond expectations of the public, the community were more indebted to him than to any other man, for he labored most emphatically to heal those infirmities, and to guard against the evils to which it was exposed." The charge that he was a monarchist finds its refutation in the testimony of his colleagues and in his own declaration of principles. He declared that the political principles of this country would endure nothing but a republican form of government.

The great task of the American statesman after the framing of the Constitution was to secure its ratification. For this purpose Hamilton, Madison, and Jay published the "Federalist." In their articles they pointed to the defects of the Confederation and their remedy by the adoption of this Constitution. Hamilton was the master spirit of the "Federalist." His acuteness of reasoning, diligent

research, and soul-stirring earnestness carried conviction to the mass of the people.

The "Federalist" has been compared with the writings of Aristotle, Montesquieu, and Burke. It has been the wonder and delight of European statesmen. It has filled the bosom of Americans with patriotism, and stands next to the Constitution among the precious legacies of the golden age of American statesmen, orators, and patriots. It should be cherished as one of the ablest expositions of the Constitution. In its effects, it stands far above the spirit of the laws, for it realized its most glorious visions. It enlisted friends throughout all parts of the Union; conquered the prejudices of Clinton, the logic of Samuel Adams, the fiery eloquence of Patrick Henry.

After the inauguration of the new Constitution, Hamilton accepted the position which was the most difficult in the government. The maxims he introduced in the management of the finances have governed the Treasury ever since. From these varied and extensive labors, his position in American history is to be judged.

Hamilton stands as the intellectual peer of the statesmen of the time. Among all speculative philosophers he is second to none. His genius devised the splendid system of government. Every thought was allied to it. It absorbed his attention in the camp, on the toilsome march, and in the halls of Congress. In his services for the Union, his greatness of intellect, posterity will recognize a resemblance to the chief, whose adviser and bosom friend he was.

What Washington was to the age which preceded the Constitution, Hamilton was to the age that witnessed its birth and introduction. Without the one, the young Republic might never have existed. Without the other, it might have been the mere record of a past institution, whose history had been glorious until faction and civil discord had turned it into a record of mournful recollections. No Chæronea witnessed his cowardly flight, or Ægina bore testimony to his unmanly indulgence. As orator, statesman, and military hero, his trophies are unsurpassed. Monmouth and Yorktown witnessed his valor. The halls of justice and legislation testified to his eloquence.

So long as the American government shall be a model for the nations of the earth; so long as it blesses the oppressed; so long as its flag shall be an emblem of the highest civilization; so long shall it stand as a monument to its founder, Alexander Hamilton.





THE CAREER AND CHARACTER OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

BY OLIVER E. BRANCH, '73.



THE name of Alexander Hamilton is closely identified with the struggle of the Revolution and the founding of the Republic. We are to review his military and civil career, and consider the prominent traits of his character.

The martial spirit of Hamilton was early manifest. "I wish there was a war," he wrote from St. Croix; "I condemn this groveling position of a clerk." His wish was soon gratified. Arriving in America during the exciting days preceding the Revolution, he quickly espoused the cause of the colonies; rousing them to resistance by his impassioned eloquence; and defending their actions in articles so ably written, that they were ascribed to the classic pen of Jay.

Upon the breaking out of hostilities he left his books at King's College, raised a company of

artillery over which he was appointed captain, and at the battle of Long Island covered the retreat of our army to the Heights of Harlem, where his skill in constructing defenses caught the observant eye of Washington. At White Plains he again distinguished himself; bore an active part in the brilliant achievements of Trenton and Princeton, bringing his shattered company into winter quarters at Morristown. Here he became aide-de-camp on the staff of Washington. At once the bosom friend of his commander, Hamilton preserved a constant fidelity all through the dreary night from '77 to '81. Were important letters to be written, prisoners to be exchanged, missions executed, intrigues thwarted, cabals crushed, to Hamilton Washington ever looked for assistance. In him he found his most trusted lieutenant, his wisest counselor.

Relieved from the more active duties of the soldier, Hamilton early directed his attention to those problems of government which the weakness of the Confederation demonstrated. Congress was demoralized, the army reduced, industry paralyzed, the currency depreciated. The cause of these evils he discovered, their remedy he suggested; and the letters to Morris and Duane, with the papers of the "Continentalist," stand to-day as the record of his marvelous genius. An unexpected incident led to Hamilton's resignation from the staff of Washington; soon after, he was placed in command of a battalion of infantry. Eager to achieve the success in arms which had been the dream of his youth, he entered upon the closing campaign of the Revolu-

tion, and at the head of his troops he planted the tattered banner of the colonies upon the parapets of Yorktown.

The war ending, Hamilton returned to civil life. He immediately began the study of law; was admitted to practice in a few months, and quickly rose to the front rank of the profession already adorned by the talents of Livingston and Harrison. From his splendid achievements at the bar he was called to the aid of the still unsettled States. Peace had come, but not prosperity; victory, but with it, discord; exhaustion, but not repose. The States, no longer bound together by the power of a common interest and the fear of a common danger, were ready to rise up against one another in domestic war. To calm local prejudices, party strifes, and sectional animosities; to form a healthy public sentiment and lay the foundations of a permanent government, Hamilton steadfastly labored through those five years of unrest succeeding the Revolution. Representing New York in the Congress of '82, he was recognized as the leading spirit in its deliberations. Often originating, always advocating, sound systems of national policy, sustaining them with all the power of his eloquence, he there gave evidence of that breadth of understanding which signalized his subsequent career. In the New York legislature of '87, we see him again the champion of the wisest measures. Here he overthrew the opposition to the treaty, and secured the passage of the act for the establishment of the State University and its schemes of public instruction.

The measures adopted by the Congress of '82, to relieve the financial embarrassments of the States, proved ineffectual. From this resulted the Convention of Annapolis in '87, in which Hamilton drafted the memorable report to the States which called for the Convention of Philadelphia. In that remarkable body, rendered yet more imposing by the presence of Washington, we find Hamilton, at the age of thirty, an acknowledged leader. How much he contributed to the final action of the Convention we may never know. "Yet," says Gouverneur Morris, "the leading principles of the present Constitution were the ideas of Hamilton." True it is that the Constitution when submitted was not such as he wished, but when convinced it was the best then possible, he spared no effort to secure its adoption. How well he labored the immortal pages of the "Federalist" testify.

Remarkable as was the career of Hamilton thus far, the crowning act of his life was to follow. In the discharge of his duties as Secretary of the Treasury, it was necessary for him not only to organize that department, but to form and put into operation a complete system of revenue and finance. Money, there was none; public and private credit were gone; agriculture and manufactures prostrate; commerce broken; the national debt unpaid. In such a condition of affairs Hamilton began his work. Out of this chaos and confusion he brought system and order. Immediately commerce, manufactures, and agriculture revived; credit was established; revenue created; the public faith maintained; and

the young nation started upon its career of prosperity and honor.

Subsequent events in the career of Hamilton established beyond doubt his reputation of a statesman. To state how he aided in suppressing insurrection, preserving neutrality with foreign nations, sustaining the administration of Washington and thwarting the designs of Burr, would be to repeat the history of those dangerous days of the Republic; and not until that fatal encounter with Burr did the nation realize how beneficial had been his life, how glorious his career.

Character is the complement of the qualities by which a person is distinguished. These qualities may be analyzed. They are seen in a life; manifested in a career. What then was the character of Hamilton? Sprung from a father of Scottish origin, born of a mother in whose veins flowed the blood of the Huguenots, he combined somewhat of the speculative vigor of Scotch mind with the nervous activity of the French. From these inherent qualities were developed the prominent traits of his character,—sagacity, wisdom, energy, practicality. His life is crowded with the evidence of these sterling traits. It was his sagacity in striking at the principles of action which astonished his hearers in the “great meeting in the fields.” This it was that made him the confidential adviser of Washington and gave him success in the field, the cabinet, the convention, and at the bar. His was the wisdom that organized the Treasury and proposed a stronger government. His the persisting energy which followed the struggling

colonies through "evil report and good report." His the practicality which set in motion the best system of revenue and finance which the nation has ever seen.

To these elements of his character was added that of great integrity. Above the trickery of the mere politician, he stooped to no concession in which manifest right would be compromised or the public faith violated. With a chivalric sense of honor which could not endure even the reprimand of Washington, a devotion to justice which dared at the risk of position and influence to defend the right of a hostile nation, he stood fearless and unmoved.

We have noticed the separate traits of Hamilton's character. Viewed as a whole, it was eminently objective. Ambitious he was, but rarely for self. Engaging manners, singular genius, variety of talent, and strength of intellect, qualities which might have made him a most dangerous citizen, he devoted to his country, often to the sacrifice of his own interests. Of him said Talleyrand, "I have seen a man who has built up the fortunes of a nation, toiling all night to support his family." For a Union strong and enduring, he lived and labored. No other evidence of his disinterested character is needed than the fact that, with every opportunity to secure a fortune, he retired from the management of the Treasury a poor man. Rather than that the suspicion of official corruption should rest upon him, he disclosed a stain upon his moral character which ordinary prudence would have concealed and which charity has long since forgiven. Rather than dimin-

ish his chances of usefulness to the nation, he yielded to the imperious claims of false honor, and yielding fell.

Hamilton was not perfect, though in public life he committed few great errors. Incorruptible in office, inflexible in the discharge of duty, his services were of lasting benefit to the nation, and have made his name and fame as enduring as the Republic.





ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND THOMAS JEFFERSON.

BY GEORGE W. KNOX, '74.



AFTER the war for independence was ended, when the national existence was assured by the adoption of the Constitution, two great parties were formed. Both professed the same great end,—the welfare of the people. Both professed equal zeal for the Constitution, but each held the other's views to be radically wrong, attributed sinister designs to the opposing party, and proclaimed no safety for the nation, except in its own counsels.

Each party, patriotic and sincere, was willing to support its views even with blood. Each was marshaled by a leader of consummate ability and perfect integrity.

For a time the neutral position of Washington restrained the conflict. All united on him as the head of the government, and the political struggles were confined to matters of minor importance. But even in the council of the great revolutionary chief.

tain the war at length broke out. The great leaders were nominally united in Washington's cabinet; but, in truth, all the deliberations of that coterie of statesmen were disturbed by their political dissensions.

The history of these two men, Hamilton and Jefferson, is a political history of their times; and in their influence can be traced the influence of those primitive parties upon the after life of the nation. Both men were well fitted for the parts they were to play. Hamilton was a leader of leaders. Haughty, domineering, aristocratic, feeling his innate superiority to the mass of men, he was little suited to move the popular mind. Among the few men knowing him as he really was, his personal magnetism, clear mind, wonderful power of conception, and still more remarkable powers of execution, brought him unquestioned supremacy.

Ever unpopular among the people, he indirectly influenced them more than any other man of his time. He ruled his party with a rod of iron. At the beginning of every campaign, and at the opening of every Congress, his hand marked out the path to be pursued. Holding the reins of the minority he was victorious in many a conflict, and for twelve years made his party dominant.

Hamilton was distrustful of the people and openly admired the British constitution. Anarchy was the only danger he thought imminent; and he strove to prevent the dissolution of the Union by giving the greatest possible power to the general government. Jefferson was Hamilton's antipode. Finely edu-

cated, early entrusted with responsible positions, idolized as the author of the Declaration of Independence, plain in dress and tastes, he was eminently fitted for popular leadership. Added to all these personal attractions he was a firm believer in the people, and regarded them as the true source of government. He saw the spectre of a tyrant in every act of the Federalists, and thought Hamilton ever plotting for monarchical institutions. A democrat of democrats, he disliked all ceremony and aristocracy. In return, the people honored, trusted, loved him.

In Washington's cabinet Hamilton was, in the main, successful. He advocated the strictest integrity and honor in the payment of national indebtedness. He carried out his doctrines of government to their legitimate conclusion in the assumption of the State debts by the general government.

Jefferson, thinking this country a confederacy, not a nation, opposed him. Hamilton planned the establishment of a national bank, issuing its own paper and performing all the functions of a great financial institution. Jefferson, thinking too great power was given to the government, opposed the scheme. Hamilton succeeded in both, and the credit and prosperity of the nation were restored.

While in domestic concerns Hamilton's influence was predominant, Jefferson controlled the foreign relations. He continually showed his hostility to Great Britain and friendship to France in spite of Hamilton's opposition. Yet above all parties, Jefferson loved his country and never allowed his

foreign sympathies to interfere with the national honor.

At last Hamilton succeeded in his plans and added the prestige of Washington's great name to his party. Jefferson, tired of broils and unsuccessful conflicts, resigned. Hamilton, actually needing money for the support of his family and no longer confronted by a worthy opponent, soon followed. Their places were filled with Federalists. Federalism was triumphant in Congress and the cabinet.

When Washington declared his purpose to retire at the end of his second term, the political strife again vehemently broke forth. For the position of President, Adams and Jefferson were the candidates. Hamilton, still ruling in the councils of his party, was again successful. For a time all was smooth sailing. The embryo French war forced the principles of the Federalists even upon the Republicans. In their strength the Federalists were weak. Adams, confident of his popularity, resented the rule of Hamilton, turned his friends from the cabinet, and proclaimed more moderate views. The party entered upon the fourth presidential election torn by internal dissensions and suffering from the reaction consequent upon the French peace. It was defeated. Its fall was final.

Jefferson ruled so wisely and in such conformity to the people's will that his power was secure. Even after his retirement to the quiet of Monticello he continued to control the affairs of the nation.

What has been the posthumous influence of the two men? Whose ideas have prevailed? Both

have exerted a moulding influence on the government.


After the Revolution, when the people had just made tremendous sacrifices, the national tendency was to the extreme of popular freedom. Anarchy was the real danger. Federalism was the corrective. The national idea needed to be strengthened. Great power was needed to enable the government to fill the Treasury and restore prosperity. Hamilton, preferring limited monarchy and distrusting the people, possessed the precise qualities needed to restrain the Jacobin tendencies of the populace. After a period of peace and prosperity, however, when the people began to trust the government that protected them, it was time to exalt popular sovereignty. Jefferson, as President, checked the tide that threatened to carry the government to limited monarchy.

The influence of both men remains. Public opinion, formed by long experience, agrees with Jefferson in trusting implicitly the people, in making them the source of political power; in part, at least, believing the old proverb, *vox populi, vox Dei*. At the same time it believes with Hamilton in clothing the general government with great power, making no confederacy but a true nation.

Hamilton and Jefferson could lay no claim to perfection. Their lives and systems were alike faulty and incomplete; but their private sins and public mistakes have been too rigorously rebuked. At least, after time has cooled the warmth of party strife, when their real characters may be impartially known, all the ancient slanders and political gossip

should be forgotten. Their distinguished services to the infant Republic surely entitle them to the love and reverence of their countrymen.

With their errors forgiven, their contentions forgotten, their virtues exalted, their names should ever be linked together as joint authors of systems that are the foundation of our government.





THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE POLITICAL DOCTRINES OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

BY WILLIAM H. DE WITT, '75.



IN the year 1787 was assembled in Philadelphia a body of thoughtful and earnest men. The dignity of Washington and the judgment of Franklin ruled the house; while the wisdom of Alexander Hamilton gave eloquent expression to the thoughts and hopes in every man's mind. A few years later, there was a convention in the city of Paris. There also sat the representatives of the people. But there were hate and terror and bitterness; while at their very door stood that black engine which was marking with blood the hours of the French Republic.

Each assembly was making a political constitution, which should "secure the blessings of liberty, to themselves and their posterity." In their first manifestations, the revolutions in France and America were alike. In each, man asserted his rights; and taught modern politics a lesson in liberty.

Whenever a people overthrow a tyranny, only the soundest wisdom and virtue can establish a safe government. With this task before them the conventions met at Philadelphia and at Paris. The action of each assembly was the development of its national character. The moral and political constitution of the French rendered self-government impossible. There was among them no faith, no trust. Conscience was fettered by a church, or distorted by a sentimental atheism. There was no strong middle class. The nobility once overthrown, a debased populace were the legislators. In the American colonies, everything was different. Their strength was a substantial middle class. The virtues of Puritanism and the republican principles of Calvin were in the minds of all the people.

Under such circumstances the demagogues of France led their country through the Reign of Terror, back to despotism; and the Federal party in America guided a trembling people past their dangers, to the realization of a safe popular government.

The political doctrines of Alexander Hamilton were the principles of the Federal party; and Federalism and the French Revolution present the strongest contrasts. The immediate cause of the latter was bankruptcy and starvation. Men united to obtain bread; but after the first outbreak there was only a confused strife of factions, a fierce struggle for life.

The American Revolution was a solemn declaration of manhood; and its principles were developed

by the Federal party. Federalism had a definite object. Its effort was to form a government which would give liberty to every man, and security to every man's neighbor.

A popular government is safe from the tyranny of an aristocracy; but its very nature is an invitation to mob legislation. To preserve the country from the excesses of democracy, was the constant effort of Alexander Hamilton. His doctrine was to give the people the power of governing, but not the opportunity of tyrannizing; the responsibility of supporting, but not the liberty of overthrowing the state. He would make a government representative; but not representative of ignorant masses. He would banish the title of aristocracy, but not the distinction of virtue and intellect.

The course of the French Revolution is a striking illustration of the evils which Hamilton feared. There, distinctions of name and intellect were alike destroyed. The worst men ruled; and the strength of their government was the fear which it could inspire. French terrorism had its representative in America. Popular leaders sought to raise mobs after the style of the Paris *canaille*. The riot of Baltimore would have become the streets of revolutionary Paris; and the opponent of Hamilton in that sad tragedy on the shores of the Hudson would have added strength to the councils of Marat and Robespierre. Opposition to such an element marked Hamilton's political policy, and saved us from the oft-repeated fate of republics.

When the American colonies had gained inde-

pendence, there sprang up a feeling of competition and jealousy. The object of the Federal party was complete unification and a strong central government. Their means to this end was mutual consent and agreement. Their way to Union was through self-sacrifice for general welfare. Such sentiments among the revolutionists of France were unknown. The want of a strong central government was the nation's destruction. Hundreds of terrorists gave law to thousands of terrified. He who thought of compromise was lost; and the only success was beyond the death of every opponent.

Federalism and the French Revolution manifest their principles in their characteristics. France proclaimed a universal brotherhood. She offered sympathy and assistance to every sufferer; and, with her own people starving and murdered, wished to lead all nations to a grand realization of liberty. America made no such gracious professions; but modestly established a safe republican government.

In France was wild sentiment and shocking profanity. A rouged opera-dancer was made "Goddess of Reason," while senators and rabble together fell down and worshiped their new divinity. Robespierre decreed "the existence of the Supreme Being"; while Cloutz held, that "there is but one God, and that God is 'the people.'"

In contrast to such a spirit is the sober dignity of the founders of our Republic. They still remembered and adored Him, who had been to them the God of battles and the God of peace; who had led their fathers' steps to a free land, and who would

guide the feet of their children through a prosperous and happy future.

The French began with their Revolution a new era, and dated "Year of the Republic, One." The American people would rather know the time of their political birth as "the Year of our Lord, 1776."

The fundamental principle of federalism was lawful liberty; that of French Revolution was lawless freedom. The one viewed man as a moral agent and an accountable being; the other, as an utterly irresponsible creature. The French Revolution taught some narrow creed about the "rights of man." Federalism enforced the old lesson of "Love thy neighbor." The one was heartless selfishness; the other was Christian charity.

The results of the French Revolution and federalism were what their beginnings promised. France found and proclaimed liberty. But she only grasped that long-sought blessing, to turn it into a curse. She distorted and defiled the reality, after the ideal had been so ardently worshiped. Her Revolution ruined the character of her own people; and crushed the hopes of others. It connected with the thought of liberty, all the horrors of the September murders and the revolutionary tribunal.

The labors of Alexander Hamilton and his party have borne their fruits. Men had long dreamed of a republic which would guarantee to its citizens liberty and security. The experiment had often been tried, and had often failed. But here were good materials for a new effort. The people were prepared for a popular government; and the right men were at hand to guide them.

Since the foundation of our Republic, the teachings of Hamilton have been often forgotten. State rights have been presumptuous, and the Constitution has been profaned. The government which "derived its just powers from the consent of the governed" has been severed with violence, and united by force. Indiscriminate suffrage has gained ground; and more power has been placed where Hamilton feared to trust it. But through all our history, our wisest statesmen and strongest administrations have made the Constitution their chart and compass. In perils at home and abroad, our safeguard has been the Constitution; and the framework of the Constitution is the political doctrines of Alexander Hamilton.





ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND SALMON P CHASE.

BY HOWARD P. EELLS, '76.



THE history of American independence presents two crises, one in its attainment, the other in its preservation. In each finance was the question of questions. The arbiters of the financial policy shaped the national destiny. They were Hamilton and Chase.

The men were different as their fields of action. Hamilton's life though illustrious was varied and fragmentary; begun in romantic uncertainty, breaking off in the midst like some theme of a tragic poet, amid tears and blood. Toward him we look, as said the Greek poet of his tragedy, "with pity and with fear"; toward Chase as to a Christian as well as a patriot. One was the elegant man of society, magnetic in personal attraction, favorite of all. The other of stately bearing, reserved in aspect and demeanor, indifferent to social allurements.

In intellectual power, in depth and versatility of mind, Hamilton was greatly superior. But he was

wont to sacrifice expediency to persistent assertion of personal convictions, detracting from the popularity of his measures, jeopardizing their success. Chase tempered advocacy of principles with forecasting wisdom. Deferring when possible to the popular sentiment he insured the accomplishment of his purposes. His mind was not speculative. He was actor rather than thinker. As lawyers Hamilton was an advocate, Chase a jurist. The former by eloquence and subtlety of mind excelled at the bar; the latter by logic, dignity, and method was fitted for the bench. As financiers Hamilton possessed genius to originate, Chase wisdom to conduct; one was theorist of the possible, the other of the probable; one was constructive, the other executive.

"By introducing order into our finances," said Hamilton, "by restoring public credit, not by gaining battles, are we finally to attain our object." He saw that besides the constitutional authority necessary to its existence, the government needed a public Treasury supported by private capital. The wealthy and influential must be attached by ties of personal and pecuniary advantage. The experience of our civil war tended to confirm Hamilton's theory, that the Union was in more danger from an undue assertion of State authority than from executive usurpation.

The first Secretary of the Treasury unfolded his scheme of a national bank as containing "the ingredients to constitute a wholesome, solid, and beneficial paper credit." Believing paper emissions

by the federal government a seducing and dangerous expedient, liable to abuse, and "likely to produce an inflated and artificial condition," he remitted such issues to the several States. A departure from this principle was the great error in the policy of Chase. In the pressure of a financial crisis, the Treasury empty, credit exhausted, every other expedient rejected by Congress, he assented to a measure which his judgment condemned,—the substitution of United States legal-tender notes for bank circulation. Chase himself as Chief Justice afterwards declared the measure unconstitutional. Political economists agree that the license extended to the department was employed to an extent which depreciated the currency and rendered the return to specie payments a remote possibility.

The national banking system as elaborated by Chase was a war measure. It served the imperative need of the times. Upon its permanent utility financiers are divided. Only when divested of its war associations and made to operate upon a coin basis can this be determined. That it strengthened government credit, is adapted to the demands of business, and being subject to government control furnishes a currency of uniform value throughout the States, are the chief merits of the system. The main objections urged against it are its control by the central government, the possibility of its employment in the interest of political parties, and its tendency toward centralization. Yet in the words of McCulloch, "It is the best system now in existence, and should be sustained until a better is

devised or until the country is prepared to do without banks altogether.⁴

To ripen inquiry into action, to justify the Revolution by its fruits, was the design of Hamilton. He was architect of an ideal form of government, framer of much that is best in the Constitution, originator of a financial system which gave an impetus to enterprise and traffic, and afforded the germ of the national system of to-day. For Chase it was to maintain that government and Constitution, to amplify and complete that system. To him we owe the machinery of the Treasury department as it now exists. To his executive energy the nation is indebted for measures which, however questionable in their ultimate effect, sustained our armies and carried the war to a successful issue. When the perplexing years of his Secretaryship were ended, he wrote to William Cullen Bryant, "Looking back I see no measure which my judgment condemns except the issue of legal-tender coupons. . . . My grand objects have been to provide for the vast demands of the war and to substitute a national bank-note currency." The attainment of these objects in face of obstacles and opposition was the glory of his administration. "Whether the genius of Hamilton, dealing with great exigencies and with the small resources, transcended that of Chase, meeting the largest exigencies with great resources, is an unprofitable speculation. They stand together in the judgment of mankind the great financiers of our history."

While the fame of Hamilton will shine brighter

than that of Chase, it is doubtful whether his service was more vital. Hamilton's official career though brilliant was brief. That of Chase included a generation. In each love of country was the prime incentive. Hamilton was loved perhaps more than trusted; Chase trusted more than loved.





ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND WILLIAM H. SEWARD AS POLITICAL LEADERS.

BY HENRY W. COCKERILL, '77.



THE Revolution and the Rebellion are the two crises of our national life. Following the Revolution came the Democratic party led by Jefferson, and the Federal party under the leadership of Hamilton. The latter impressed itself upon the new-born national life, and disappeared from the political arena.

Preceding and during the Rebellion, there were two political parties. The one adopted the views of Jefferson as given in the Resolutions of 1798; the other held to the heritage of the Federalists. Of the latter party, William H. Seward was, for years, the acknowledged leader. We are to compare Hamilton, the Federal, with Seward, the Republican leader.

As political leaders there are between Hamilton and Seward many and striking contrasts. Each led his party through danger, peril, and war, and each

is remembered to-day with grateful affection. But their labors were different. Hamilton labored to create the Union; Seward to preserve it.

At the beginning of the Revolution, Hamilton, with the enthusiasm of youth, "engaged first his pen, and then his sword, in the stern contest." From his first entrance into the army till "the Little Lion" planted our tattered ensign on the parapets of Yorktown, he was always the brave, impetuous, chivalric leader. Peace declared, the soldier became the statesman, and he entered into a bloodless, though no less stern and weighty conflict. Amid open rebellion, disgraceful riots, anarchy itself driving our country to ruin, with clear head and steady will he reasoned, persuaded, and led the nation into the path of liberty, secured by constitution, and strengthened by law.

As Scotch he loved liberty, but loved order more. With the nervous activity of the French he executed with vigor what he planned with shrewdness. With these characteristics there was none in his day more fully able to meet the demands of the hour. His warm and kindly nature, lively manners, and brilliant conversation drew around him a circle of devoted friends whose allegiance nothing could weaken. With this surrounding he reared the Federal party. Leading a minority, with indomitable energy, he, for twelve years, made his party dominant, and placed the infant nation fairly on the road to prosperity and greatness.

When Seward attained the leadership of his party, the country was in scarcely less need. The evils

foreseen by Hamilton were slowly but surely approaching. What he had called "the centripetal force" in the government was weakening, and the doctrine of his old political enemy was rapidly gaining ground. The time had come for action, and with it came the leader. With cautious deliberation he surveyed the ground, saw the proper course, and steadfastly pursued it. The awful question of slavery loomed up; he met it fairly and squarely. His party became unpopular; but he worked on. At last he was successful; and when the party, in its triumph, found it necessary to place the wreath of victory upon the brow of a "younger soldier in the great cause," without faltering, failing in no trust, he still led his party.

Both Hamilton and Seward were great leaders; but as the men and their labors, so their methods of work were different. Celtic dread of oppression and love for the lowly made Seward a leader of the people. The gallant and intrepid aristocrat, Hamilton, was a leader of leaders. At the bar, in the convention or in the cabinet, Hamilton was always the soldier, fiery, passionate, irresistible; Seward was the citizen, able, calm, convincing. In the middle ages, Hamilton would have been the peerless knight; Seward would have been the staunch burgher of a free city.

When Hamilton, in the Convention, found himself without a supporter, he told his opponents they were wrong,—radically and fundamentally wrong. Then with cogent argument and persuasive eloquence he brought them over, one by one, to his

side. When Seward, in the Senate-chamber, was the only Senator who maintained "fully and fairly the doctrine of the issue of slavery," distinguished on the one hand from compromise, and on the other from rabid abolitionism, he told the other Senators that they were, in the main, right; but that they were not taking the right road to accomplish their object. Then carefully and deliberately he showed them the right way, till at last he had his reward as leader of the Senate.

Hamilton had force, while Seward had tact. Hamilton, by sheer power, led men in spite of themselves. He marked out the path to be followed and drew others to it. A clear reasoner, seeing plainly the path, and arguing rightly from it, his path was, perhaps, the true one; but it was his path, not the party's. He was the leader; his party followed. Seward, on the other hand, found the people's path; that to which the strong intelligence of the nation drifted. There were two divergent lines of national policy. A conflict was inevitable. Both could not go on. Thoughtfully he weighed the two; then deciding which one was to him best and right, he threw himself upon that, and led the people in their path.

Hamilton was a leader from above and without the people; Seward was from among them and on a level with them. Hamilton said, "I know where you ought to go. Come on. This is the way. Follow me." Seward said, "I know where you wish to go. I can show you the right way. Come with me." The one was a leader; the other a guide.

When Hamilton died, his life breaking off in the midst "like some half-told tale, amid tears and blood," the Federal party was practically broken. Upon the death of the leader, the party went each his own way. But when Seward died, the party kept right on ; it was their path in which they were walking, and they had simply to find another guide.

Hamilton realized the need of his time, but he revered precedent and tradition ; he took the past and strove to make the present and future fit it. Seward honored the lessons of the past but analyzed the present ; used the past to aid in that analysis, and then from the present, seen in the light of the past, strove to forecast the future. Hamilton stood upon the past, drawing the present to him ; Seward stood upon the present, measuring it by the past.

As statesmen Hamilton was brilliant, Seward was sure ; the one eloquent, the other able. The former had genius ; the latter had talent. With Hamilton patriotism was a sentiment, an enthusiastic passion ; with Seward it was a principle as well as love. With Hamilton it was the supreme law ; with Seward it was a law under a "higher law."

Each acted well his part ; one was the counselor of Washington, the other of Lincoln ; and to their counsel and leadership is largely due the security of our institutions.



ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND LOUIS
ADOLPHE THIERS.

BY CHARLES S. STONE, '78.



THE history of a nation is the lives of its great men ; theirs is the essence of those innumerable biographies which make up the records of the past. The story of a great life is something more than a study of character and incident ; it is a study of the times in which the great man lived, and of the movements in which he took part. The lives of rulers and statesmen and the reformers of the church are our civil and religious history ; and the lives of the masters are the history of art. The annals of France's brightest, proudest years are found in the life of one great captain, and the history of the Reformation is but a narrative of the lives and labors of Luther, Knox, and Zwingli. So in the story of the lives of Hamilton and Thiers, we may study the times in which they lived. The life of one tells of the formation and early history of a republic, and with the other we are carried through a stormy half-century of French reactions.

Reaching manhood at the breaking out of the Revolution, Hamilton entered ardently and sincerely into the cause of his adopted country ; and from his address before the patriots of New York, through the eight years of strife and conflict and the score more of reconstruction, down to that fatal July morning, his career was interwoven with the history of the nation. Springing from the lower ranks of society, Thiers raised himself, by the vigor of his intellect, to the very highest. Whether as minister or as leader of the opposition, around him more than any other centres the last half-century of French and European politics. No revolution was effected, no restoration accomplished, no popular movement undertaken in which he was not the central figure.

Hamilton's statesmanship was constructive. No mean part was his in the Revolutionary struggle. But after the conflict, in the reaction, when the States were divided by faction, jealousy, and selfish interest ; when the labor of years bid fair to be thrown away, and a threatening gloom had settled over the road to national honor ; when Washington, who was not prone to be despondent, said, " To be more exposed in the eyes of the world, and more contemptible than we already are, is hardly possible " ; then Hamilton displayed his constructive genius and masterly statesmanship.

The history of the early years of the Confederation is a narrative of blunders and disasters, the blind and the ignorant fighting for the leadership. The Continental currency had become a byword for all that is worthless, and the finances were pitifully

involved; Congress was fading into a mere name and a shadow of a shade; sectional bitterness alienated the States, threatening to divide them into commonwealths independent, if not as hostile, as Italian principalities and German states; we may indeed be said to have "reached the last stage of humiliation," for those disastrous blunders and hopeless dissensions were greeted in European courts with all the exultations over a prophecy fulfilled.

From this melancholy chaos, through Hamilton's endeavors, a coinage was established, a revenue system inaugurated, an army and navy organized, a national bank instituted, and commercial treaties arranged; and as Guizot, with his clear insight, has observed, there is not in the Constitution an element of order, of force, or of duration which he has not contributed to introduce into it and caused to predominate. This great work he followed up by training the thinkers of the North, through the influence of the "Federalist," in political integrity, and inspiring respect for law and faith in the central government.

Thiers began his political career as the defender of revolutionary governments. "I am of the party of the revolution in Europe," he said. "I shall do all that I can to keep it in the hands of the moderate party, but if it should pass into the hands of a party not moderate, I shall not abandon the cause of the revolution. I shall be always of the party of the revolution"; and here lay his real strength. As leader of the opposition he was a power dreaded by kings, loved by people. But in France office is

everything ; Thiers sought office. He proved unfaithful to his revolutionary principles, unfaithful to the lowly rank from which he sprang.

Statesmanship is of as many kinds as there are statesmen, yet statesmen may be separated into two distinct classes. One, like Machiavel's Prince, "seeks to dethrone the Almighty and exalt the devil"; casts off morals, lays aside conscience as inconvenient to great undertakings; blots out the line between truth and dissimulation, between honor and treachery as a cramp to vigorous action; deceives friends, betrays enemies; and banishes all scruples, all gratitude, all honor, in attaining to the one great end of politics,—success.

This principle, or rather absence of principle, has ever marked the policy of France. Selfish, grasping, careless of all but her own aggrandizement, her ideas of national greatness is but national self-seeking. And Thiers was a characteristic Frenchman. He who once proposed a crusade to restore liberty to oppressed nations, afterwards "desired" the dismemberment of Italy, the division of Germany, and demanded that all the world should bow the knee to France.

Thiers passed through every conceivable variety of opinion, shifting his belief for every changing shade of popular impulse and caprice. As the revolutionary journalist of '30 he is the first to resist encroachments upon the freedom of the press, and as the minister of '35 he enforces, with vigor, the laws against free speech; to-day a liberal, to-morrow a conservative, a republican, a monarchist, the bitter

enemy of socialism and its defender by turns; a determined opponent of personal governments, the personal governments of Louis Philippe and Louis Bonaparte were raised upon his shoulders, and when he came to power in '71 the world had not seen so personal a ruler since the first Napoleon. Thiers forgot that "principles make revolutions and revolutionists," forgot that "principles found monarchies, aristocracies, and republics," forgot that "principles govern the world." Whatever impeded triumph, Thiers, and France, though it be the majesty of justice, right, and honor, was thrust aside without scruple, apparently without regret.

The other kind of statesmanship has its ideal in the conscience, and is the outgrowth of a pure and honest patriotism, and its fruits are the fruits of righteousness, the blessing and bettering of mankind. Such was the statesmanship of Marin, struggling for the honorable liberty of Venice; of William of Nassau, pious and firm, lifting the oppressed Netherlands to a place among the powers of Europe; of Washington, refusing the offered crown, satisfied and happy to grow old and dim of eye while fighting his country's battles; the statesmanship of Hamilton, relinquishing profession, wealth, and honor for a public service barren of promise, giving up his life because he felt that only by conforming to popular prejudice could he be of further service to his country.

"Writers, orators, publicists are only great when they connect their whole lives into stars which revolve around a grand idea. When they become

the centre of their own universe, when they value politics only for the lustre reflected upon themselves, and ideas merely because of the brilliance they impart, then they lose the right to be public teachers, they forget the service of humanity, which is their only glory, their only pledge of immortality."

Principles govern the world; he who seeks to rule without them will find his life a hopeless, barren task.





THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

BY CHARLES E. DE WITT, '79.



ALEXANDER HAMILTON and Aaron Burr were political opponents and party leaders. Both were men of brilliant minds, elegant manners, and high ability. The former was a patriot and a statesman. The latter was "a dangerous man" in the Republic.

When Aaron Burr was nominated for governor of New York, Hamilton opposed his success. Burr's defeat at the polls culminated their long hostility. The scene at Weehawken followed. Hamilton perished, and his relentless enemy had his revenge.

The correspondence leading to the encounter reveals the spirit of the parties. The aggressor was determined and implacable. His victim reluctantly obeyed the dictates of the so-called code of honor. General Hamilton had spoken of his rival as "one who ought not to be intrusted with the reins of government." An explanation was demanded. Hamilton considered it neither his duty to explain

nor disavow an honest opinion. In loyalty to his commonwealth, he had expressed his deliberate judgment upon the character of one who aspired to be its governor, and he could not acknowledge his accountability to a disappointed politician.

On June 27, 1804, the correspondence ended with a challenge and its acceptance. He who had risked life for his country was above the imputation of cowardice. But Hamilton shrank from this encounter. He abhorred a duel from principle, and his duty to live for friends, family, and State conflicted with the demands of what his contemporaries called the honor of a gentleman. Unwillingly and doubtfully he yielded to the latter.

July 11 was fixed for the meeting. At the dinner of the Society of the Cincinnati, on July 4, Hamilton last appeared in public. The intervening days were spent in private preparations. He felt a premonition of his doom. The seal of death was upon him, and like one who stood upon the sands of the Roman amphitheater, he seemed to say to those about him, "I, about to die, salute you."

On the morning of the fatal day, the sun looked over the Harlem hills upon the New Jersey shore bright and beautiful. Heaven seemed to smile upon the deed. Upon Weehawken Heights, opposite Manhattan Island, the parties met. Ten paces were measured. Positions were chosen; the word given. The result the world knows. Burr turned from the field with a look of mingled pleasure and regret. Hamilton had fallen without the intention or attempt to use his fire.

The few remaining hours of this noble life were passed in terrible torture, and in heroic efforts to comfort his despairing family. "Remember you are a Christian," were his last words to his wife; and armed with a simple, trusting faith, he faced and conquered the last great enemy.

On July 14, 1804, were paid the last honors to the fallen statesman. The city of New York seemed one great household stricken with anguish for the loss of its dearest member. With solemn toll of church bells, and heavy boom of minute-guns, and words of honest eulogy, to which every heart said a sincere "Amen," they laid him to rest in the God's acre of Trinity Church; and there amidst the busy hum of the great city, he sleeps within hearing of the heart-throbs of that country which so loved him, because he first loved and served her.

The death of Alexander Hamilton was a loss to our government; its manner, a gain to society.

Hamilton was a Federalist, a conservative, perhaps an aristocrat. His political policy was to strengthen the general government, to regulate carefully suffrage. A successful sovereign must have wisdom to legislate, virtue to administer, and power to execute. In the United States, sovereignty rests with the voters. The voters must be selected with regard to this responsibility. In this syllogism is an epitome of Hamilton's statesmanship. By the delicate touch of his skilful fingers the balance-wheel of Federal control was fitted to the dangerous engine of democracy; restraints were put upon the power of the demagogue, and

checks applied to the reckless enthusiasm of popular assemblages.

In the first years of this century appeared within our borders that monster, which to-day has grown into threatening proportions, which has laid its polluting touch upon the politics of our great cities, and is demoralizing the legislation of our whole land. I mean the evil influence over the passions of the ignorant and vicious which extensive suffrage gives to self-seeking politicians. That danger which De Tocqueville feared, and Lord Macaulay prophesied would be our ruin. Hamilton fought this evil in constitutional conventions and political contests; and, in a longer life, his ripe wisdom and lofty character would have done good battle in the same righteous cause. The loss of his conservative influence was a severe calamity to our government.

When we regard the effect upon society of this sad event, we find a decided benefit. It was the death-blow to the custom of duelling. When courts of law were in their infancy, the duel was a species of judicial trial. Men in difference resorted to single combat in the belief that God would give the strong arm to him who had the just cause. Tennyson's Sir Galahad expresses the popular belief of those days,

“ My strength is as the strength of ten,
Because my heart is pure.”

The true heart was believed always to be behind the strong lance, and the just cause to be clothed with physical power and courage. He who would not

fight was not only thought to be, but almost universally was, a coward and a knave. The victor, amidst the clash of arms, was the hero, the godlike, the only honorable. But the later civilization introduced the rule of mind. Courts banished tournaments. The judicial ermine and the famous jury-box usurped the authority of balconies of smiling and approving beauty, and the duel, once an honored adjunct of a younger civilization, sank to the level of murder.

In 1804 this lesson of modern history was not fully learned. But when it was blazoned before the eyes of a horrified nation, written in the blood of Alexander Hamilton, the argument against the morality of the duel became awful and convincing proof. Among roving knights of the twelfth century Aaron Burr would have held a high place ; among gentlemen of the nineteenth, he was a ruffian.

Let us not too harshly censure Hamilton for accepting the challenge. A refusal would have branded him a coward. Was his act a weakness, a fear of a perverted public opinion ? Judge him not thus, O man of to-day, unless you can stand before the bar of your own conscience and declare your emancipation from the slavery of contemporary public opinion.

As a victim to a custom which had survived its reason and its excuse, died America's greatest legislator. He was a power in two revolutions, one political, the other social. Had he lived longer, our government would have been more heavily in his debt. Had he died differently, society would owe him less. In his life, he was a guide to the young

Republic, which was falling into line to join the march of nations. In his death, men learned to strip a crime of the gloss of gentility and give it its place in the catalogue of heinous sins.

When Aaron Burr drank so deeply that sweet cup of revenge, the life-work of Alexander Hamilton was ended ; but at the altar of this costly sacrifice was emphasized the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." ; and the duel, as the trial of a gentleman's honor, received its sentence of doom.





THE POLITICAL DOCTRINES OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT AMERICAN HISTORY.

BY PHILIP A. LAING, '80.



THE political history of America has witnessed the ascendancy of two opposing doctrines. The earliest advocate of home rule and limited executive power was Thomas Jefferson. He held that danger to a free people lies in centralized administration. Every step in the direction of additional authority to the national government he looked upon with anxiety. Opposed to him was Alexander Hamilton, leader of the Federal party and rightly called the "Founder of the American States in Empire."

The struggle which framed the Constitution and merged the Confederation into a nation brought these opposing doctrines and their advocates prominently into view. In that struggle Hamilton was preeminently conspicuous; and when it closed he was well fitted to administer, and shape the policy of the government which he had helped to form. He

at once became the idol of his party and the trusted counselor of Washington. He was the champion of national over State supremacy, the advocate of a protective tariff, and was thoroughly conversant with the principles of political economy.

Suffering from the losses of a protracted war, without friends or credit abroad, her currency depreciated, her people half-hearted in allegiance, upon the election of Washington the Republic sorely needed a statesman able to grapple with great problems of finance. Depreciated paper money had destroyed confidence, disturbed prices, and business was stagnated. Every financial scheme proposed met vigorous opposition. The need of the hour was a stable medium of exchange. To pay the national and State debts was impossible. To drift was ruin; and every remedy devised was, in the minds of many, but another step toward utter financial ruin. At such a time Alexander Hamilton was made Secretary of the Treasury. And such was the condition of the country when he originated that system of finance which became the wonder and admiration of the world.

His first plans were to fund the national debt so that its securities should in part answer the purposes of money; to increase the duties on imported articles; and to establish a national bank. The difficulties encountered were great. Strong prejudices were prevalent against every form of banking. Half of the people were bitterly opposed to an increased tariff, and the sentiment was every day growing that the only hope for the country was repudiation. The

proposition to assume the State debts met with determined opposition. But mercenary interests were not permitted to stain national honor. The national debts, foreign and domestic, were admitted; the State debts assumed, and the securities given were made to answer the purposes of money. This was Hamilton's "grand triumph," and "looking back from this period in the history of the country upon the developments which succeeded it must appear both fortunate and deserved." Spurning repudiation, the nation vindicated her honor at home and abroad.

The prominent features of the national bank, chartered upon the plan which Hamilton proposed and which received its death-blow under Jackson, are identical with those of the system revised under Lincoln and which still continues in existence. Hamilton favored a national bank because its issues are regulated by the demands of business. It is plastic. Unlike those of the government its issues are withdrawn when the need for them has ceased. The bank originated by Hamilton was exclusively controlled by its stockholders. The government reserved the right to ascertain only its general condition. Under our present system the circulation is secured by a deposit of government bonds. Not wholly unlike this feature was the provision of Hamilton's bank which required three quarters of the subscriptions to be receivable in six per cent. certificates of the national debt. Hamilton advocated a vigorous administration and a united people,—united by common interests, a common language, and a common

medium of exchange. To secure the universal acceptance of its issues, he favored the supervision of the bank by the government. To insure efficiency of management, he enlisted the experience of business life and the stimulus of private interests.

Hamilton was an advocate of a protective tariff. The resources of the country were then undeveloped, manufactured goods were procured abroad, and England was then as pronounced for protection as she now is for free trade. In view of these facts Hamilton held that protection was a necessity. In later times Clay and Greeley have rallied powerful parties clamorous in advocacy of the same policy advanced by the leader of the Federalists.

A national banking system, a protective tariff, and national supremacy were the political doctrines of Alexander Hamilton,—fundamental principles of government. Put to the test when all Europe was disturbed and when the American people were little used to republican ideas, they have extended their influence over a full century of our history and to-day are recognized as living and vital principles. Among financial policies none finds greater favor among intelligent business men than the national bank. Its issues are reliable and have the public confidence. It has been tested in important epochs of our history. By its influence the financial status of the country at the close of the Revolution was improved and prosperity to commercial interests assured. Again at the close of the Rebellion, in spite of the disastrous effect of the greenback issues which tended to destroy confidence in every form of money, the people still


believed in the national bank; and now under the revived condition of business it challenges the admiration of all. Judged in the light of recent American history Hamilton's system of banking is a great success. A hundred years of the most varied and trying experience have developed nothing better.

Within the last half-century the policy of protection has doubtless been pushed too far. The protection which in former times enabled the country to develop its resources has more recently helped to enhance the wealth of powerful corporations at the expense of the laboring and consuming classes. But if a wise judgment does not now approve of the system it surely recognizes the wisdom which dictated such a policy during our early history.

The political doctrines of Hamilton sprang from his belief in the necessity of national unity. This belief was shown in his advocacy of national supremacy and a liberal construction of the Constitution. Unchecked by the conservative influence of Jefferson and his party, Hamilton would have delegated dangerous powers to the general government. The space which separates Hamilton's ideal of a republic and an actual empire is not very great. Yet the doctrine of Jefferson was perhaps still more dangerous. In later times we have seen how this later doctrine, pushed to extremes by Calhoun, ended in secession. If the gravest result of the Rebellion was the injury suffered by the rights of States, the grandest result of that struggle was the triumph of national supremacy.

The political doctrines of Hamilton still exert a

potent influence upon the country. They are deep-rooted in our national life. In Hamilton Talleyrand recognized one whose "comprehensive and penetrating intellect had pierced through and through the very substance of the politics of Europe." Hamilton's doctrines were the fruit of a deep and thorough study of the science of government. During our rapid advance in wealth and influence they have shown the adaptive power which belongs to principles rather than expedients. Their effect has been far-reaching and permanent, and the memory of their author shall be as lasting as the Union which he helped to form.





ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND THE TARIFF QUESTION.

BY HARMON J. BLISS, '81.



NATIONAL policies are largely the creation of individuals. Only through the master minds of a nation are popular aims realized. For centuries the German people had longed for a complete union in government, but not until the statesmanship of Bismarck linked the states in one supreme nationality was their ideal realized. A thirst for military glory has ever been characteristic of the French people, but they waited the coming of Napoleon to make Europe their battlefield. A love of freedom had glowed for ages in the breast of Italy, but liberty was not secured until Cavour directed her diplomacy and guided the arms of her soldier-king.

In securing the adoption of the Constitution, Alexander Hamilton, in America, gave to his country the Union which Bismarck has given Germany, the independence which Cavour insured to Italy, and a power more permanently great than the blood-bought empire of Napoleon. Hamilton crystallized the best

political thought of ages, to shape with it the structure of our government. Chiefly by his master statesmanship a crumbling confederacy was bound together under a central power, and made to assume its rightful place among the foremost nations of the world. While the dogma of State rights brought us to the brink of commercial and political ruin, the triumph of Hamilton's doctrine of a strong Federal Union has made us a prosperous and powerful people. Defended by the eloquence of Webster, triumphing with the surrender of Lee, the Federal Union will insure the liberties of coming generations, and keep forever green the memory of its author.

But the fame of Hamilton does not rest alone on his advocacy of a strong and enduring Union. As the earliest advocate of a high protective tariff, his name is identified with a question which demands for its solution the keenest intellect of the age. On this question Hamilton took no uncertain ground. He saw the impossibility of American capital, comparatively small and drawing a high rate of interest, battling even-handed with cheap and abundant British capital. Competition with British manufacturers was then, as it is now, only possible on two conditions,—first, capital at an equally low rate of interest; second, equally cheap labor. The first was an acknowledged impossibility. The attainment of the second no patriot could desire, for no patriot could wish the working classes of our country to be reduced to the poverty of the European laborer. Hamilton desired, by securing to the laborer adequate wages, to enable him to live in comfort, and

enjoy the advantages of just compensation. No statesman more fully deserves the gratitude of the laboring classes. Directly opposed in their attitude toward labor, are the advocates of free trade. These advocates in Europe, the great English capitalists, have reduced the laborer to a mere machine, almost as really owned by them as the ponderous looms which weave the fabric of their wealth. It is a truth recognized even by conservative Englishmen, that their statesmen have almost utterly disregarded the welfare of the laborer. The eloquent Ruskin says, "Though England is deafened with spinning-wheels, her people have not clothes; though she is black with digging of fuel, they die of cold; and though she has sold her soul for grain, they die of hunger."

Hamilton advocated the tariff as favorable to national interests. He saw that only by the creation of capital through manufactures could the nation's natural wealth and commercial enterprise be developed. He saw that only through an increased population, sustained by manufactures, could a home market for agricultural products be secured. Destroy this market, and the farmer is left to compete for an European one, with the products of the almost servile labor of Russia. While Hamilton upheld protection for the nation's interest, Southern leaders have favored free trade as a sectional advantage, and as opposed to the interests of the manufacturer and the farmer. The South has always desired free trade, and for one reason only,—her own supposed benefit. No regard for the national welfare has ever been shown by Southern statesmen in their labors for immediate

sectional advantage. They have failed to see that were the great heart of the nation still, the life-blood of prosperity would stagnate in every artery. They have been slow to understand what political economy regards as axiomatic, that no nation exclusively agricultural can prosper, and that the protective system which benefits the North is the great need of the South. The weakness of a nation exclusively agricultural is exemplified by Ireland. Ireland is to-day suffering more from a lack of diversified industries than from land tenure or rack-rent. Hamilton's system of protection would give Ireland wealth not derived from the soil, and free her people from entire dependence upon the landowner.

Through the power given by the fostering influence of the protective system, our nation has expanded from a border of States fringing the Atlantic, to a broad commonwealth spanning the continent. Deriving, in the early period of our history, almost our entire wealth from the pursuit of agriculture, by the influence of the same system, there is scarcely an industry or source of opulence known to man, which is not forced to contribute to the nation's prosperity. Yet this prosperity may be but the morning star, heralding a dawn of national greatness whose splendor shall surpass the expectation of the most sanguine. Let us then, as Americans, guard well our national policy; for while, using the accumulated wisdom of the past, we may realize the most golden dreams of the patriot, we may by folly or incompetence lose the heritage of power, and retrograde to weakness and obscurity.

The highest encomiums which can be bestowed upon the genius and sagacity of Hamilton are furnished by the evidences of happiness and progress which we see throughout the land. The statues of the illustrious Romans were placed in the Pantheon, and their names linked with those of the gods above. The memory of England's departed great men is enshrined within the walls of Westminster Abbey. To Hamilton himself, in the city whose commercial supremacy he did so much to enhance, a statue has been erected; but surpassing in dignity all other memorials, the power of the American Republic is the grandest monument to the memory of the defender of American industries, and the "Founder of the American States in Empire."





ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND BENJAMIN DISRAELI.

BY HERBERT H. PARSONS, '82.



SEPARATED by race, religion, politics, country, age; widely different in habits of thought and method of work; actuated by motives as far removed as pole from pole, Alexander Hamilton and Benjamin Disraeli present a striking contrast.

Born of Scottish and Huguenot parents, Hamilton united in himself the sincerity and intellectual vigor of the sturdy Scot with French grace and versatility. His mental powers developed with remarkable rapidity. But the genius, though marvelously precocious, was full-rounded and symmetrical.

At fourteen he is in charge of his employer's entire business. Two years later find him a candidate for admission to Columbia College. Not till then does he, a foreigner by birth and a loyalist by education, begin to appreciate the excited feelings of the colonists as they fret under the yoke of British rule. Amid the growing resentment of the colonists and

the deepening hostility of the British, his decisive nature can occupy no natural ground. Without reserve he casts his lot with the struggling nation in whose fortune and destiny he is to play so prominent a part. Thenceforth his life became the history of the infant Republic.

First, we see him as the slender lad of seventeen "at the great meeting in the fields" swaying the mighty multitude by his resistless logic and marvelous eloquence; then as the cloistered student preparing those masterly papers, now famous as the "Answers to a Westchester Farmer." With the beginning of the Revolution we see him perfecting himself in the theory and art of war; we go with him into the heat and roar of battle; we note his dauntless courage and military skill; we see him promoted; we see the boy of twenty years the trusted counselor of Washington; we listen with admiration to his words of wisdom; we see him as he starts on many a delicate and perilous mission; we watch his course through the four long troubled years of war. We see him forecasting the result, prophesying harder problems in government and finance yet to come, and preparing himself to meet them. We are with him as he struggles with ignorance, prejudice, and unreasoning opposition. We see him the educator of the people, lifting them to a higher plane by the attractive power of his own marvelous intellect. We see him the object of envy, hatred, and revenge. We see him emerge unharmed from the cruel darts of slander and the poisoned shafts of malice. We struggle with him in his magnificent fight for a con-

stitution and a national government. We stand by him as he "forges the links and welds the chain" which shall bind in one indissoluble Union the warring States. We share his triumph and glory when liberty is rescued from license, peace takes the place of turmoil, and law and order are triumphant over anarchy and disunion. We see him at the sacrifice of private interests, taking upon himself a public trust whose only reward shall be the suspicion of friends and the malignant opposition of enemies. We see a state in bankruptcy, with no credit at home or abroad, cut off from sound commercial relations with foreign countries, with trade paralyzed and industries dead, at the vivifying touch of his matchless genius suddenly taking on new life and assuming her proper place among the nations of the earth. Out of adversity, poverty, and universal despair we see him building up a financial system which shall not only stand the test of peaceful years but shall tide us safely over the perilous billows of civil war. We see the great financier whose ability had made a whole country rich and prosperous, laying down his public trust because of private poverty. We behold him as America's greatest lawyer, pleading the cause of a poor woman. With the enraptured jury and the admiring judge, we feel the charm and potent spell of his impassioned appeals and convincing argument. Again we see him the object of partisan passion and personal hatred. Passion turns to frenzy, hatred to revenge. He whom slander could not injure nor threats silence, falls a victim to Burr's deadly bullet. We watch him during his last

hours as hope alternates with fear; we look upon the stricken nation and startled world; we see his great spirit take its flight, and his mighty work is ended.

Benjamin Disraeli's life reads like a romance. Coming into the world unknown to fame, without influential connections, in a land of caste and prejudices, and the son of a Jew, the outlook seems indeed gloomy. To Disraeli's hopeful, dauntless spirit, however, all things are possible. Even in youth with prophetic eye he sees the glory of the coming years. He believes in his race, his country, and his own great destiny. "Power is the end to be attained, ambition the force that impels." Never once in all the years of political strife and personal conflict does he lose sight of his grand life object. All things are made subservient to this ruling passion. Conviction, consistency, and even conscience are sacrificed on the altar of inordinate ambition. All other things are but stepping-stones in his upward path. The guiding principle of his life is summed up in the angel's exhortation to Tancred, "Fear not, faint not, falter not, obey the impulse of thine own spirit and find a ready instrument in every human being." Undismayed by failure he is never unduly elated by success. Four times defeated in his efforts for political power, he presents himself a fifth time for the suffrages of the people. Elected member of England's House of Commons, he is the subject of ridicule, scorn, and foolish race prejudice. Bold even to rashness, his first speech is an attack upon Ireland's great national hero. Laughter, derision,

and hisses are the result of his audacity; cool, crafty, farseeing he fights on. He sees men of every class finally bending to his indomitable will. He encourages the faint-hearted, strengthens the weak, flatters the vain, dazzles the young. He throws his opponents into contempt by his wondrous wit, biting sarcasm, and bitter taunts. Steadily he pushes on in his path to power. A cabinet position is offered and accepted. Thrice Chancellor of the Exchequer, he is still looking upward. Now the acknowledged leader of the Tories, he keeps his life policy of "waiting and watching." With the resignation of Lord Derby in '68 comes Disraeli's opportunity, and the wildest dreams of his youth are realized. He stands upon the dizzy heights of power to which a less daring spirit would never have aspired.

Mark the mighty changes of that life! He who began life as the friend of the poor, the champion of the people, and the advocate of reform, is now the leader of the aristocracy. The Whig of twenty becomes the Tory chief. The author of "Vivian Grey" is ranked with Bulwer, Thackeray, and Dickens. The ridiculed, hissed, detested Jew is premier of England.

Hamilton and Disraeli! The statesman and the politician! The son of patient toil, and the favored child of chance. Both were men of unquestioned talents. Hamilton's genius was practical, receptive, adaptive, creative; that of Disraeli, brilliant, imaginative, erratic, paradoxical. The weapons of one were logic, argument, appeals to man's higher na-

ture; those of the other, wit, sarcasm, appeals to the imagination. The one convinced, the other dazzled. Each the head of a great party, the one led by the force of preeminent ability, the other by flattery, promises, taunts, and threats.

Hamilton believed that work alone conquers. Disraeli had implicit faith in the "star of destiny." Thoroughness, knowledge of details, complete mastery of every subject was the secret of the former's success; an intense and unwavering conviction of his "great future" was the ever impelling incentive of the latter.

Both were ambitious, but their ambition was widely unlike. Hamilton was ambitious that the nation might become grand and glorious; Disraeli, that his own name might become the synonym for greatness and power. "Country" was the ever present thought in the mind of one; "self," the all-predominating idea of the other. Eternal principles of truth and justice were the guides of Hamilton's conduct; expediency, the rule of Disraeli's actions. The one was a moulder of public thought, the other a follower. Hamilton based all legislation on the "great laws of nature." Disraeli shaped his measures to match the ever-varying shades of fitful public sentiment.

The measure of a man should be the influence which he leaves behind him. Tried by such a standard, the contrast between the two becomes even more marked. The waning splendor of Disraeli's genius pales before the enduring glory of Hamilton's. Hamilton is lost in the grandeur of his work,

while in Disraeli's life the man himself is continually before the mind. The life of Hamilton is knit with that of his country. His lasting monument must be the growing greatness of that nation whose arms he did so much to make victorious, whose government he framed, whose credit he restored, whose policy he shaped, and whose name he made respected in all the hostile courts of Europe. Disraeli must be remembered chiefly as the author of a brilliant foreign policy which, whether born of pride and glory or of sound statesmanship, time must still decide. The one labored for all time, the other for temporary power.

But one year in his grave, Disraeli's influence is rapidly passing away, while Hamilton's great work is calling forth increasing admiration and his fame shines with an added luster with every passing year. The character of the latter will live as an inspiration to unselfish effort and lofty patriotism, that of the other as an example of the power of a determined will when coupled with a grand, all-ruling passion.





THE POLITICAL SERVICES OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND DANIEL WEBSTER.

BY EDWIN B. ROOT, '83.



ALEXANDER HAMILTON and Daniel Webster stand in the perspective of our national history as leaders, at successive periods, of kindred forces striving toward the same end.

The political services of Hamilton were conspicuous in three results,—the framing and adoption of the Constitution of the United States ; the organization of national finance ; the control of the Federal party. In 1786, amid State quarrels threatening intestine strife, Virginia called a convention to consider the commercial condition of the country. Hamilton, perceiving, grasped the opportunity ; and through this convention summoned the States to send delegates to Philadelphia to perfect a plan of government. His earnest convictions, supported by his strong logic and brilliant eloquence, brought about the adoption of a strong centralizing Constitution. Hamilton distrusted pure democratic forms. He saw the evils of a mere federa-

tion of States. He felt that the remedy lay in moulding these States into a nation. His first great political service was in giving to our Constitution its national force.

Upon the promulgation of the proposed Constitution Hamilton became its chief advocate. He explained its provisions and while forecasting its dangers urged its adoption. He thus did a double service. He won immediate popular favor for the Constitution, securing its adoption, and he laid down with unsurpassed clearness and force the maxims which should guide in its application.

The first condition of the success of the new government was adequate revenue and national credit. Hamilton becoming first Secretary of the Treasury mapped out a financial policy, quickening into life, supporting, and perpetuating the prosperity of the young Republic. It placed in the hands of the government the powerful weapons of a sound credit, a productive revenue, and a strong national bank. It compelled respect abroad, loyalty at home. Around this financial policy Hamilton drew the supporters of the national view of the Constitution, and the monied class throughout the country. From this union sprang the Federal party, the direct result of Hamilton's genius as a politician. Through the remaining years of his life Hamilton was the shrewdest counselor and ablest leader of the Federal party. As a Federal leader, even when not in office, he supported a high protective tariff. When the war storms sprung from the French Revolution were wasting Europe, and a minister of the Guillotine

Republic had landed at Charleston, Hamilton urged and secured a policy of strict neutrality. In the hour of Federal defeat, when, Jefferson and Burr having equal votes in the electoral college, a Federal Congress must choose one of them as President, Hamilton did no mean service in securing the defeat of Burr. He recognized in him a scheming, unprincipled adventurer in politics. To save the country from his unscrupulous grasp, he by his influence placed his bitterest political foe in the office of chief magistrate.

Alexander Hamilton's work was finished when on the shores of the Hudson he paid with his life for this last great service to his country.

Daniel Webster was the younger prophet upon whom the mantle of Hamilton fell. His great service, like that of Hamilton, was for the Constitution. Twenty years after Hamilton's death, just as Webster had established his place of leadership, antagonistic forces in our government again joined issues. The evil which menaced the country was not unforeseen. Hamilton had warned against it; Webster had long dreaded its approach. State rights springing into life at the very birth of the Constitution was always the spectre at the feast, and now grown strong with years it threatened with disintegration our national life. When Col. Hayne's adroit attack became known it seemed as if the glorious work of Washington and of Hamilton must be undone. To Webster the loyal heart of the nation looked to defend its national life. With a genius able to cope with the smallest fallacy and full of his glorious theme he nobly met the attack of Hayne, exposed

the heresy of State rights, and sketched for future generations the broad national grounds upon which our Constitution rests. Three months later he closed the debate by his great constitutional reply to Calhoun. Nullification was crushed in our halls of legislation to rise again only by an appeal to arms. To Webster's constitutional services in the Senate were added his efforts at the bar. His arguments on the steamboat monopoly, steamer "Caroline," and Dartmouth College cases won for him the grateful title of "Expounder of the Constitution."

After the overthrow of nullification there sprang up from the old Federalists, and those who supported the national bank as established by Hamilton, the Whig party, under the leadership of Clay and Webster. As one of the founders of the Whig party, Webster stamped upon that organization the properly modified financial doctrines of Hamilton and the Federalists. In Hamilton's time our industries were weak and needed strong protection. Webster, finding them full of life and vigor and no longer needing excessive support, adopted and incorporated in the creed of the Whig party a policy of moderate restriction. As a Whig leader Webster's service was negative rather than positive. He, with Clay, guided the party in the paths of compromise with slavery, striving to save the Union even at the cost of yielding to the South. In opposing the annexation of Texas, he sought to save the country from the constitutional perpetuity of slavery, which would inevitably have followed the division of Texas into several slave-holding States. In supporting the Kansas-Nebraska compromise he saved the country

from itself. If the Rebellion had occurred in 1850, public sentiment would have been with the South and slavery would have triumphed. In the years gained by that compromise, the great Northwest filled in, the anti-slavery sentiment in the North grew stronger, and the war of 1860 crushed slavery forever. The statesmen and soldiers of 1860 and 1865 did no truer service to the nation than did the earlier leaders, who, wisely yielding in weakness, gained time for freedom to grow strong.

Alexander Hamilton was the suggester and advocate of the Constitution. As Secretary of the Treasury he placed upon a sound basis the commercial interests of the country. As a Federal leader he averted a war with England, and thwarted the dangerous schemes of Burr. Daniel Webster crushed the State rights doctrine in the Senate, expounded the leading principles of constitutional law in the courts, supported as a Whig leader the financial doctrines of Hamilton, and aided in postponing, until "the fullness of time," the final issue between slavery and freedom.

Hamilton and Webster belong to the formative state of our Constitution. They were needed in its times of trial and did well their work. Their grand service was for a broad, deep, American nationality.

When the final struggle between State rights and national unity came, signaled by the opening gun at Charleston, the thought of loyal America rested on the profound political foresight and wisdom of Hamilton, the heart of America uttered, with a new thrill, the familiar words of Webster, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."



THE DEBT OF OUR GOVERNMENT
TO GEORGE WASHINGTON AND
ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

BY EDWARD M. BARBER, '84.



GREAT Republic honored and respected throughout the earth. A system of government the freest and best regulated in the world. A nation, despite its conflicting elements, the type of enterprise and patriotism. Such is the legacy inherited by every American of our day. Such the gift handed down to "millions yet unborn" by the fathers of the Republic.

To no two men does the impartial historian deem America under greater obligations for the civil and religious liberty she enjoys than to Washington and Hamilton. Stormy and unsettled times hung over the country when they began their work. The mother country, forced by a misguided ministry, would compel submission to unjust enactments. Insulted at home and abroad, the colonial spirit was thoroughly aroused. Resistance or moral slavery was the only alternative.

Three distinct epochs mark the relations of Hamilton with Washington. As an aide-de-camp to the great general, as an assistant in the formation of the Union from the Confederation, and as a powerful abettor of the President in placing the country upon its feet, he performed vital and essential work. To them then, as soldiers, patriots, and statesmen, our government is especially indebted. It may well be doubted if either could have accomplished the work he did without the assistance of the other. It would not have satisfied, had either exerted their talents without being in closest sympathy. The one needed cool, guarded restraint. The other impulse instilled by brilliant theories.

The country was involved in an all but disastrous struggle with England. The possibility of the future existence of our government depended upon the position then taken and maintained by the infant colonies. A great general was needed who could wrest victory from a seemingly hopeless encounter. In their extremity the colonists turned to the one man who enjoyed their unbroken confidence. The man "who was not born to be killed by a bullet" was placed at the head of the armies. To his staff was appointed the young hero of "the meeting in the fields." And what deeds were accomplished in arms? Witness the toilsome days of the weary eight years that followed. Toilsome days, but many of them made famous by achievements surpassed on no field across the waters. Only the genius of a thorough commander could inspire support during those perilous times. None but a Wash-

ington could weave a fabric of success out of the incongruous materials at his command. See him animating that forlorn hope at Valley Forge; striking the enemy from ice-bound Trenton; guiding the campaign of '81, so disastrous to the foe; and weaving that fatal web which terminated British rule in the colonies, at Yorktown.

During this trying period the support of Hamilton was of great importance. It has been well said that he held the pen of "the Junius of the American army," and busily was it employed in the service of his general. As an envoy and field-officer he gained the highest praise. Too young to hold the highest command, he yet gave evidence of sterling and brilliant qualities.

But the war was ended. The smoke of battle rolled away, and the last boat which carried British arms had left our shore. The country, indeed, was saved as by fire. Yet the Confederation, shattered and spent by the long drain on its resources, trembled in its work. Empty coffers alone remained to satisfy an immense war debt. A weak and impotent financial system offered but empty promises to importunate creditors. Anarchy itself, dire and dreadful, stared the people in the face. Under such unfavorable omens opened the second epoch.

Called to a seat in Congress, Hamilton worked earnestly for a reorganization of the States. State and party interests in many cases opposed the measure. Equipped with a system of government, clear in every detail, he labored earnestly with all the strength of his genius for its adoption. The Con-

vention meets in 1787, and frames the Constitution as afterwards adopted. Instantly his support is given to the new act, as though it is his own. The opposition again attack the instrument through the press, but the utterances of the "Federalist" compel their silence. The great State of New York makes a final attempt to withhold its adhesion. We picture to ourselves that stormy convention in New York City, and the fearful odds against the champions of the Constitution. We see the hard-fought battles during the days that followed. We hear the result of the final vote, and recognize that to Hamilton the government of the United States owes its existence more than to any other man.

The third epoch dawns. The new government is formed. The body indeed is created, but lacks a living organism. A power must be given it or it will collapse. Shall it stand or fall? Clearly and decidedly do the President and Secretary draw tighter the reins of government, and strengthen our national finance. A Genet is recalled to distracted France, and our American foreign policy is proclaimed abroad. A Whisky Rebellion is suppressed in Pennsylvania, and the sovereignty of American authority is recognized at home. A complete statement of the funds of the national Treasury is published, and the people consider the monetary system as firm and safe.

To few men has it been permitted to stamp their character indelibly on the nation. Our American government has been formed and established through the influence of no others more than Washington


and Hamilton. A feeling of intense nationality pervaded all their acts. Personal motives were always subservient to national demands, and they would detect and apply these when others would fail to notice them. True it is that some of Hamilton's acts were guided by passion, and were unworthy of his otherwise illustrious career. Yet his unimpassioned thought was always for his country.

To Washington, our government to-day is accustomed to look as to its founder. It is no mere flattery when he is, perhaps fondly, styled the "father of his country." "The working and existence of the new government," said a writer of that day, "altogether depended upon the moral force which his name and character would bring to its chief office." The pure and lofty sentiments which he infused into his policies, even yet throb through the pulses of our national life. He labored for a unity of government, for an enlightened public opinion, and the development of virtue and morality, as national traits. He turned from a buried war record to the promotion of agricultural wealth, as a true basis of national prosperity. He invoked the approval of divine sanction on public as well as private acts, and best enabled our government to become the creation of independent and sovereign people.

It is not too much to say that in all the three departments of the government, executive, legislative, and judicial, it was Hamilton who, at the outset, planned, explained, and vindicated the course that must be pursued by them. We attribute to

Marshall the establishment of the judiciary as the supreme source of law, and to this he is of course entitled. But back of these are the essays of the "Federalist," the fountain from which Marshall's views of the scheme of government are drawn. To him our government must ever be indebted for its financial system. "He established the doctrine of a liberal construction, and of the implied powers; and shares with Washington the honor of devising and carrying out our foreign policy."

To them our government owes a great debt. Their public acts were only for the nation. As they were national in thought and spirit, so in this later day do their lives awake in every patriot breast a renewed love of country. Purified at the altar of true devotion to country are the statesmen of our day made nobler and stronger.





ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1800.

BY EDMUND J. WAGER, '85.



THE Presidential election of 1800 closed the administration of the Federalist party and ended the public career of that party's guiding genius, the founder and defender of American nationality, Alexander Hamilton.

Twelve years of prosperous experiment had passed and had revealed a future bright with possibilities. The shattered Confederacy had become a nation. The Constitution was no longer a device of monarchists, it was the accomplishment of statesmen, and the party that had grown in its defense stood triumphant in its victories.

If wise and harmonious counsels had attended the hour of success, the election of 1800 would not have seated Thomas Jefferson, a Democrat, in the chair of Washington and Adams. But dissensions and jealousies arose. Alien laws and stamp duties completed a series of imprudent measures which an inconsiderate majority enacted to its own destruction. The parties entered the contest well matched.

The Federalists were in power and were strong in numbers, but the Democrats were better fighters and were better united. Both sides poured into the struggle all the bitterness of a tempestuous era. The part that Hamilton took in this election was important. It revealed most strikingly the weakness of the man, who, in the early years, when the floods of passion beat against the state, when liberty and union trembled in the balance, bore the government upon his shoulders. Behind the sunlight of his fame, which will illuminate the history of this nation until the volume shall be closed forever, his faults and foibles fade away.

Two elements contributed largely to elect Jefferson, the skilful management of Burr and the indiscretion of Adams. It was from Aaron Burr that the Democratic party learned how to win its victories, and it was at his hand that Hamilton received his first defeat.

The campaign began early, and Federalists and Democrats gathered their forces for a fierce conflict. It was evident that the election in New York would decide the struggle, and that New York City would decide the State. Presidential electors were then chosen by the legislature elected in April. In New York City, in the spring of 1800, Hamilton and Burr measured their strength and fought out the decisive battle of the campaign. Hamilton entered the canvass with all the resources of a powerful intellect, unrivaled eloquence, and a profound knowledge of principles. Burr, energetic, persuasive, untiring, was the prince of demagogues. He bribed

the avaricious, flattered the vain, and threatened the timid. Not the minutest detail, whether in the availability of candidates or in the temper and habits of voters, escaped his scrutiny. He was all things to all men. He won. The city elected Democratic representatives by 400 majority, and Burr was rewarded with the nomination for the Vice-Presidency.

As a leader of men, Hamilton had failed. A Federalist, proud and self-assertive, distrustful of democracy and all its works, he was never popular with the masses. He could create a financial system for a government of fifty millions, he could control at his own will the legislation of Congress, but he could not carry a ward in his own city.

The result in New York left little hope for the reelection of Adams. The Federalists were out-generated and defeat stared them in the face. If anything was needed to complete the overthrow it was found in the division between the President and the party leaders. John Adams, always a better fighter than harmonizer, appeared to his best advantage when Great Britain had a price upon his head. His Presidency was marred by disaffection in the party and intrigues in the cabinet. Of Hamilton, the real head of the Federalists, Adams was jealous, and between the two leaders existed an enmity which the coming election seemed to aggravate rather than abate. A few days after the election in New York, Adams removed from his cabinet the Secretaries of State and of War, on account of their Hamiltonian proclivities. The feud culminated in the publication of a pamphlet written by Hamilton,

containing a sharp attack upon the President. This pamphlet, which was not intended for the general eye, was stolen by Burr, and by him given to the winds. Thus again did this enterprising politician cross the path of his opponent, scattering confusion and dismay. The secret was out and there was no retreat. As a vindication of the author, this production may have been justifiable, but as a public document appearing in the midst of a Presidential campaign, the effect was disastrous. The party became hopelessly divided, and Hamilton's influence permanently diminished.

The battle had been lost, but the President was not elected. Jefferson and Burr had received an equal vote, and the choice devolved upon the House of Representatives. The Federalists in Congress saw their opportunity to confound their opponents and to strike a mortal blow at the great exponent of democracy, by voting for Burr for President. Blinded by disappointment, borne headlong on the current of popular passion, they grasped at the chance. In defense of the spirit of the Constitution, Hamilton was left alone. Anger and passion were now laid aside, and he was again the statesman, elevated above the beating waves of strife, seeking only the general good. Against his party's perilous course, he raised the voice of warning. He stood for honesty, for fair play, for patriotism in the halls of legislation. He had never yielded to the beck of caucus or of combination. If men would not listen to his counsels, he could stand alone. He labored with every argument to turn his party from its wild

determination. Many days of fruitless balloting passed, and the months of anxious suspense had nearly lengthened into spring, before his words of reason prevailed. The Federalists submitted, but they no longer held the people's confidence. The blunder was beyond remedy, and the party of Washington and Adams went from power, never to return.

Such was the memorable election of 1800. During the campaign, Hamilton was residing at New York, whither he had retired in poverty to the practice of his profession. The public services, the sacrifices, the triumphs, that had lifted the government out of anarchy and set its feet upon a rock, were accomplished years before. To these we give the gratitude of a united people. He did more to nationalize, to bind the helpless, broken colonies into a Union that should endure, than Jefferson or Washington. During every war and peril, throughout the night of rebellion, when many feared and none could foretell the morrow, our hope rested upon the principles wrought out by Hamilton. Judge him not by his errors, which were few, but by his virtues, which were many. Partisan contests were hot, and men thought earnestly and struck hard. The Federalists had been the party of sound government. They supported the Constitution, and when danger threatened, they were to it a bulwark of defense.

From Hamilton the Federalist party drew its life. While he held his place at the head of Washington's cabinet, directing by his wondrous energies the regeneration of the government, the party prospered.

When his work was done and he retired from the public service, it declined. In that history was traced a lesson to which politicians of later times may well take heed, "He serves his party best, who serves his country most."





THE MILITARY SERVICES OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

BY WILLIAM H. HOTCHKISS, '86.



THE world sees its great men from a single point of view. Let one win a memorable victory, and though he may thereafter display the statecraft of a Bismarck, posterity will remember him as a great general. If he be once popularly known as a statesman, he might conquer half the world and be a statesman still. This is conspicuously true of Alexander Hamilton. Americans recognize him as a statesman, a financier, a diplomatist. In their admiration of his services in time of peace, they lose sight of his earlier efforts in the hour of war. The stripling of twenty summers disappears behind that gigantic character, which in later years was to have a moulding influence on a nation's laws and institutions.

To the student, however, the military services of Alexander Hamilton shine out like new stars, giving an added lustre to his fame. He sees him in the fog and darkness covering that masterful retreat from Long Island. He hears him ask permission of

his chief to retake Fort Washington with but a handful of men. Again he appears at Monmouth, correcting Lee's blunders and winning victory from defeat. Finally at Yorktown, with the dash of Ney, the magnetism of Napoleon, and the coolness of his own great Washington, he captures a redoubt with the loss of scarcely a man, and makes the surrender of Cornwallis a necessity. Such is the brief history of the "little lion" of Nevis on the field of battle. And this was accomplished while in stature and in age he was yet a boy. At the outbreak of the Revolution, he offered his services as captain of artillery; and had not reached his twenty-sixth year when Yorktown fell. Ambitious, impulsive, and brave, it was not strange that his fancy reveled in dreams of military glory, and that his confident spirit should look forward to that honorable and high renown which attends the successful general. Could such a future as his restless ambition painted ever have been realized? Intrepidity, penetration, strategy, untiring activity, and magnetism,—all were his. He could plan a campaign as well as Washington, had Napoleon's fire and Wellington's skill in governing men. But a lack of that sterling quality, patience, might ere long have brought disaster. His blood, quickened by the heat of the tropics, would brook no delay. Like that other man of passionate activity, his ambition might have starved to death on a St. Helena, far from the scene of his fame.

What Americans owe to Washington for his quick perception of the merits of the youthful Hamilton

can only be conjectured. Certain it is, however, that had the great commander never invited Captain Hamilton of the artillery to take a position on his staff, we might never have heard of Hamilton the statesman. Early in '77, when scarcely twenty years old, he was offered a place in Washington's military household, as aide-de-camp and private secretary. Here ended his aspirations for a military crown. Here began his struggle for the civic wreath. For three weary years, the critical years of war, Hamilton's pen wrote incessantly. Have you ever admired the terseness, the plainness, or the dignified tone of Washington's despatches? Hamilton was their author. Have you ever wondered at the diplomacy of the commander-in-chief when Gates was striving to supersede him? In the main that too was Hamilton's work. Troup says, "the pen of our army was held by Hamilton." Here, too, then must we look in seeking an estimate of his military services. Not alone by the impetuous charge, or bravery in the front rank of battle; nor again by strategy or generalship, or by coolness in the hour of defeat, can his services be estimated. Hamilton's sword was his pen, and his magnetism came not from acts, but from words.


Picture a scene during the terrible winter at Valley Forge. It is night. Taps have long since echoed against the slumbering hills. Save the tread of the sentry, the camp is still. Camp fires are extinguished; lights are out. From one hut alone comes the glimmer of a candle. Within is a young officer, beardless, yet bearing the trace of

thought and care on his brow. No sound is heard save the ceaseless scratch of his quill, rushing over the paper. Hours pass, and still he is writing. Letters to ministers, diplomatists, and rulers are written; commands to generals, their advice to Congress. At length he pauses, and, on looking up, finds himself no longer alone. A tall, serene man has entered. Running quickly over the mass of letters, he signs them, then seems to muse and ponder. The burden of a nation's life or death seems almost too heavy for him to bear. At last he bursts out with the story of his trials, his disappointments, the dangers of his army. He unburdens the plan of the coming campaign, and at length asks, "My boy, what do you think of all this?" Hamilton is silent a moment, then begins to speak. He sees things on their bright side. The hope of youth is his; and his words are full of cheer. He talks of the coming campaign, and in a plain but respectful tone gives his opinion. When Washington departs, the doubt of age has yielded to the buoyant hope of youth.

Such were the military services of Hamilton. In later years he became the statesman. Close-linked with that must ever be the proud appellation, Hamilton, the secretary, the confidant, the friend, the younger brother of Washington.

In the light of these facts, it would be an interesting study to compare the military with the civil services of Alexander Hamilton. In which capacity, as a soldier or a citizen, did he do the most for his country? No one could answer. His deeds in the

Revolution are so intimately woven with those of Washington, that a correct estimate of them is impossible. Were it possible to separate fame from fame, to give each his just meed of praise, perchance we might learn that the days of Hamilton's youth were the days of his greatest services. Of one thing, however, his countrymen may feel sure. The military career of Alexander Hamilton led him on to those deeds which were the especial glory of an age bright with resplendent achievements. Had he been a successful general, history would mention him with Gates, Schuyler, and Herkimer. His name would never have been linked with those of Jefferson, Adams, and Morris. But the military diplomatist became, with scarcely a change in his duties, the civil diplomatist. Washington's military secretary was soon his first Secretary of the Treasury. When the pen of history inscribes the names of the heroes of the Revolution on the tablet of fame, the name of the young aide-de-camp must be written with those of Washington, Green, Lafayette, Putnam, and Marion.





THE VERDICT OF EXPERIENCE ON HAMILTON'S CONSTITUTIONAL THEORIES.

BY JOHN G. PECK, '87.



UNDER the cooperative influence of its written and precedent constitutions our nation has produced a history that reads like a romance. These constitutions have been complementary forces in all governmental legislation. Where the one has failed the other has succeeded.

Alexander Hamilton fully realized the weakness of the Confederation. The repeated failures of Congress clearly demonstrated that anarchy was threatening the nation, even before the close of the Revolution. With mere advisory power and no coercive force ; with frequent rotations in office, and the proclamation that "Each State retains its sovereignty," the States were fast separating and assuming the functions of individual republics. A profound feeling of distrust was now pervading the nation. At this crisis Hamilton stepped forward as the champion of a new form of government.

A strong Federal administration and a flexible

constitution, whose mainspring should be precedent, was the plan he advocated as the only safeguard of national liberty.

Just emerging from the despotism of monarchy, the people were opposed to a constitution savoring of a government that was proverbially associated with tyranny. Ours was not a nation moulded out of the ruins of a fallen and dismembered empire. The people created it and rendered it independent; its governor, then, the people should be. Any scheme for radical reform was received with pronounced disfavor. Many thought the Articles of Confederation could be amended to meet the exigency of the times.

Thus the constitutional framers dared not adopt Hamilton's entire plan. The epoch was not ripe for such vast strides in nationalism. Amid the clash of popular passions the propositions were thought the harbinger of aristocracy. The pulpit and press denominated them mere "Utopian dreams." Hamilton strenuously held that the States should have complete jurisdiction over their internal affairs, "for," said he, "the destruction of the States must be a political suicide."

When, finally, the Constitution was ratified, it ceased to be an untested theory. Henceforth it must stand by virtue of its own adaptation to our civilization, or be superseded by one more adjustable. The crucial test came with the Embargo Act. New England was reduced to mendicancy. The cry of "unconstitutional" arose from all quarters. Congress claimed the act was authorized by the implied

powers of the Constitution. New England submitted and endured the consequences. This was the first signal triumph of the central government over State authority.

The war of 1812 demonstrated the necessity of concerted action among the States.

Confidence in the centralized power increased throughout the nation until the extra tariff of 1816, which first drew the line of demarcation between the North and the South. From this date the history of our constitutions and the predominance of either must be read by the light of party supremacy. The South led by South Carolina claimed the right to interpose its veto on the laws of Congress, and that any State could, and of a right ought to, withdraw from the Union when national legislation became subversive of its vital interests.

But Webster in the Senate valiantly contested for the most extreme principles of Federalism that Hamilton advocated. The Constitution was not a compact. It was an indissoluble Union. Even before Webster's death the intelligence of the continent thoroughly endorsed the most unqualified views of United States sovereignty. Intense cohesion of interests prevailed, and a deep conviction of identity was holding sway over the nation's consciousness, melting away party chains, when nullification and the memorable Civil War which followed it, arrayed themselves for resistance against the supreme law.

Secession came from conviction, not from mob ignorance. The South, with her renowned states-

men, believed that the Constitution granted this incontestable privilege.

The history of this contest is a vivid epitome of the triumphs of federalism. It was a final struggle against the forces that were operating to effect a complete amalgamation of the nation and the individual commonwealths. At this crisis President Lincoln, in direct opposition to the written Constitution, proclaimed the negro unconditionally free. Congress, too, usurped the right to fix the money standard for the entire nation. This intense strain could have been once forever obviated had Hamilton's theory of constitutional flexibility been originally adopted. It was the flexibility of the English constitution that influenced Hamilton and Adams to pronounce it, with all its imperfections, "the most perfect government that ever existed." Jefferson calls this Hamilton's "monarchical predilection." However monarchical it seemed then, his principles of government have ever been the palladium of our national liberty in all great crises. When the finger of destiny traced upon the walls of a dismembered Republic unutterable ruin; when Bull Run was lost once—twice; when the Confederacy pushed on toward Washington, and the hopes of a triumphant cause were staggering under the burden of defeat; when the signs of the hour pointed to our inevitable destruction from among "the powers of the earth," the constitutional principles of that mightiest of statesmen came to our rescue, chained the fell dogs of war, and bound up the gaping wounds of a bleeding brotherhood.

Hamilton held that the powers of Congress should be so granted as to cover all necessary legislation. But Congress has compensated this real deficiency by taking advantage of the implied powers. These have ever been the chief dynamic energy in our national legislation. In citing the English constitution as overcoming this difficulty, Hamilton was correct. The tendency of all late legislation has been in harmony with a broad and liberal interpretation of our Constitution.

Cooley says that the Constitution must be interpreted by the light of contemporaneous history. This mode of interpretation has proved that we have two constitutions,—one written, and one founded on precedent. The history of the late oleomargarine bill confirms the assertion. The law prohibiting imitation wines was quoted as a precedent justifying Congress in passing such an act. Upon this basis all legislation for the adjustment of industrial difficulties must hereafter depend.

The tendency of the last constitutional amendments has been to invest Congress with discretionary powers. The cogency of this, experience has plainly indicated. It is the same reecho, after nearly a century of positive experiment, of Hamilton's design.

The severest stumbling-block in the congress of Confederation was extreme State supremacy. Hamilton resolutely struck at the root of this gigantic despot. Many years of experience have been essential to sanction fully the tenets of this doctrine. But polygamy in the West, commercial differences

in the East, could never be adjusted by the separate States, to the nation's welfare. For if Utah were sovereign, polygamy would ridicule all virtue; if California were sovereign, she would cast the Chinaman headlong into the sea. Thus the honor of our country, at home and abroad, could never be conserved by State sovereignty.

The impartial verdict of experience is the grandest commentary on Hamilton's constitutional theories. They are welded into the very tire of the wheel of America's progress, and the will-center of the continent is augmented and stimulated to its fullest development through the power and influence they have repeatedly exerted. They have equipoised the whole nation, and given us a name now "known and honored throughout the earth."





ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1787.

BY EDMUND R. WILCOX, '88.



THE American colonies, in their struggle for separation from the mother country, were actuated by two great principles,—independence and popular representative government. The Revolution had established the one; the other was yet to become the vital characteristic of our institutions. Warriors, through dangers and difficulties unparalleled in history, had wrung victory from defeat, freedom from tyranny. Statesmen must now solve even a more difficult problem; a government must be created out of the chaos of revolution.

The heroes in war became the leaders in peace; the lieutenant of Washington became the organizer of constitutional government. Alexander Hamilton was preeminent in foreseeing the need of a strong national government; not a mere confederation of sovereign States, but a government founded upon popular consent and operating directly upon the individual,—an Union, “one and inseparable.” Ham-

ilton overcame local prejudices ; and, rising above sectionalism, he sought the good of the whole people. He considered a confederation of thirteen rival States, each sovereign within itself, a "rope of sand," a delusion which must end in final ruin.

What was the condition of the Confederate States ten years after the last battle for independence? A league of independent States without resources, without commerce, without credit ; States jealous, discordant, feeble in action, verging upon bankruptcy ; the people clamorous, distressed, disheartened ; everywhere "broken promises and unrealized hopes, social and political chaos." A cloud blacker than war, filled with unforeseen disaster, hung over the land and was fast enveloping all within its foreboding folds.

Then it was that Hamilton arose to avenge the wrongs wrought by narrow men ; then it was that his genius welded the discordant States into an indissoluble national Union. His untiring spirit urged upon the legislature of New York the necessity of a strong central government ; in Congress he proposed reformatory measures ; and, to personal friends, he pictured the horrors of anarchy and fraternal bloodshed, pleading, with an earnest and hopeful voice, for the amelioration of the condition of his countrymen. Hamilton, the foster-child of America, was the beacon-light guiding her disheartened people and distracted States in the then dark hours of demoralization.

The call of Maryland and Virginia, for a commercial convention to meet at Annapolis, presented to his

sagacious mind the occasion he had so long desired. Here was the golden opportunity, which if neglected, would disappoint all hopes of consolidation; if seized, would secure national government. Hamilton was the man of the hour. He presented a set of resolutions calling for a convention "to devise such provisions as might appear to be necessary to render the Constitution of the federal government adequate to the exigencies of the Union."

The Constitutional Convention met at Philadelphia, on the twenty-fifth day of May, 1787. Here were assembled the most learned and brilliant of American statesmen. The South sent her Pinckney, Madison, and Randolph; the North her Franklin, Wilson, and Hamilton; while the majesty of Washington calmly presided over all. The Virginia plan, the first proposed, provided for three branches of government, a "Council of revision," and representation in proportion to quota of contribution; in short it contained the germinal principles of general government; while the New Jersey scheme, the second considered, was simply a revision of the old Confederation intended to bridge over the immediate difficulties. The one provided for a strong government, yet with a too broad concession to State sovereignty; the other for a weak league,—a political chimera.

After a protracted discussion of these plans, when dissolution of the Convention seemed imminent, Hamilton presented his "outline" of a strong national government. He did not offer it with any hope of its adoption. He knew too well his isolated

position in the Convention. Standing alone in the midst of contending forces, surrounded by enemies, opposed by his colleagues, he only hoped to stem the tide surging against the rising citadel of constitutional government. Should the Convention dissolve in controversy, the disruption of the frail Union would result and complete national ruin follow in its train. Hamilton saw it all. He felt the bitterness of scorn cast upon his action, but more deeply he felt the warm blood of patriotism in his veins. The life of a nation was at stake and he was the pilot of its course. In a speech of six hours' duration, expressed in simple and forcible language, delivered with impassioned energy, he not only silenced his opponents, but inspired them with the quickening impulse of his own ardent spirit. He advocated the necessity and urgency of consolidation; there must be but one head to the government. He reasoned, —Union is strength; the closer the union, the greater the strength. Hamilton considered the British government the best in the Old World, in that it secured liberty to the people, yet ruled them with a powerful and protecting arm. He recommended the English constitution as a model which America might modify to meet the New World's needs. He did not advocate the adoption of England's system, but the principles which underlie it,—the elements of strength, equality, and justice. Strictly adhering to the popular representative theory, he desired a government resting solely on the will of the American people. Although his formal plan failed to be adopted, yet he had accomplished his design; the

Convention had received an impetus which, sweeping everything before it, culminated in the adoption of our national Constitution.

Certain it is that our system of government is the work of no one man, but most certain is it that Hamilton's ideas pervade the entire structure. Guizot says, "There is not in the Constitution of the United States an element of order, of force, of duration, which Hamilton has not powerfully contributed to introduce into it and to cause to predominate."

Hamilton exercised a vast influence in private conversation with the members,—an influence which probably did more than his most eloquent debates to ingraft his fundamental principles into the Constitution. His fluency of speech, his profundity of thought, and his thorough knowledge of governmental systems, made him a powerful and persuasive orator. He grasped all the details of an argument, viewed it upon all sides, and analyzed it with a nicety and discrimination which rendered his reasoning too logical to refute and too weighty to resist.

Hamilton's work in the Convention was done. Deserted by his colleagues, he withdrew from the Convention, not in a dejected mood, not like one who had sown to the winds to reap the buffetings of the unpitying elements, but rather as one who had planted deep in fertile soil, ideas which must spring up as the living, enduring principles for a nation's government.

Hamilton returned in time to affix his name to the proposed Constitution for which he had so ardently wished and so energetically worked. Let

this last act of his in the Convention refute the unfounded aspersion that he was not in sympathy with the Constitution. Let Hamilton's singular devotion and unequaled triumph in New York's adopting convention and the remaining years of his brilliant career before the thread of his noble life was cut by Burr's murderous shot, be an unanswerable proof of his loyalty to the Constitution and of his love for the American people.





THE INFLUENCE OF THE "FEDERALIST."

BY JAMES D. ROGERS, '89.



ENGLISHMEN cherish Magna Charta as the foundation of their free government. The Great Charter through all the centuries of its existence has moulded British thought and directed British legislation. The "Federalist" is the Magna Charta of American institutions. It has been the guide of the nation, restraining from the path of error, and pointing to the way of wisdom. This great commentary anticipated the operation of the departments of the government, removed the Constitution from the domain of arbitrary interpretation, and laid the basis of a sound constitutional law. Upon this foundation the jurists and statesmen of the country have erected the vast superstructure of national proceedings. The glory of a great people has proceeded from its principles.

This famous treatise marks an era in popular government. Old theories were discarded. Republican forms were expanded and successfully applied to a vast territory. The work appeared at a pecu-

liarly critical period in American history. A mere confederation of States can resist foreign attack, or fight a war for liberty like the Revolution of '76. It is internal dissension that makes a central controlling power a necessity. At the close of the war the people were citizens of New York, Virginia, or Massachusetts, rather than of the United States. Interstate strife and jealousy instantly appeared. The year seventeen hundred and eighty-seven found the affairs of the nation at the lowest ebb. Credit was gone; bankruptcy was impending; the people were despondent. The united colonies, which had so successfully established their independence, had become alienated from one another. "State is against State, and all against the federal head," wrote General Knox. The sentiment of nationality with which Patrick Henry had fired the people scarcely existed. The federal government was a miserable farce. "The corporation of a college or missionary society," said Fisher Ames, "are greater potentates than Congress." The States within themselves lacked the attributes of stability. The "fine, theoretic government of Massachusetts" gave way at the first exhibition of lawlessness. "It was the awful spectacle of a nation without a national government."

All attempts to reconcile existing difficulties were abortive. The people did not recognize their danger. Affairs of public concern were disregarded in the zeal for personal interests. Desperate debtors, whose only hope of financial salvation was in the abolition of debts, strenuously opposed any changes which

could compel them to fulfil their obligations. Ambitious politicians, without hope of gaining influence in the national councils and fearful of losing their prestige in local affairs, bitterly resisted any concession of State authority. Influential individuals in all the States were hostile to any general union, and desired several confederacies. The great mass of the people were led to regard with distrust the prospect of a firm national government.

Such was the feeling when the Constitution was presented for ratification. The most determined hostility was at once encountered. Societies were formed to conduct a vigorous opposition. A powerful attack was made by Richard Henry Lee in the "Letters from a Federal Farmer." The many compromises in the Constitution were strongly denounced. State pride and jealousy, personal fears and animosities were aroused. The earnest efforts of enlightened patriots were stigmatized as a desire for despotic power. The contest was long and bitter. The triumph of the Constitution was due to the "Federalist" and the influence of Washington. Ineffectual without each other, their united influence overcame all opposition. The people thought no system could be dangerous which Washington firmly supported. The public mind was disposed to a calm estimate of the merits of the Constitution, and the way was prepared for the "Federalist." The statesmanship of Hamilton sent it forth. The extent of the work attracted universal attention, and the brilliancy of argument based on logical premises enforced conviction. The "Federalist" embraced

within its scope the whole political situation of the country,—the causes of disintegration, the danger of separate confederacies, the advantages of union for the preservation of State interests, and the necessity of a vigorous government for the security of religion, liberty, and property. The spirit of sectionalism, which had grown so powerful since the war, was exhibited in all the blackness of its deception and dangerous character. A flood of light was poured upon the then great departments of the government, and the whole system was illuminated by the genius of the greatest statesman of the age. The opposition pamphlet by Lee was entirely eclipsed in weight and force of argument. The "Federalist" was the great defense of the Constitution throughout the nation. The violent discussions in the State conventions were hardly more than a reproduction of its arguments. Public sentiment was revolutionized. The drift of opinion irresistibly moved in favor of the proposed system. The Constitution was adopted and the nation was saved.

The "Federalist" had accomplished its mission, but its influence continued. A difficult task still remained. "The establishment of a constitution, in time of profound peace, by the voluntary consent of a whole people, is a prodigy." The character of the "Federalist" had rendered easy the completion of this prodigy. It had defined and explained the powers of the Constitution, which would have been at the mercy of the conflicting opinions of party spirit without such an interpreter of its fundamental principles. All of the numerous commentators have recognized the soundness of its doctrine. Marshall ex-

pounded the Constitution in accordance with its principles. Webster, Lincoln, and Sumner drew inspiration from its pages. All through the nation's history, amid the vicissitudes and changes of a hundred years, the "Federalist" has guided legislation, restrained vicious theories, and promoted a vigorous national government. After three-fourths of a century, it was the spirit of the "Federalist," rather than the wording of the Constitution, that told the people that the central government had the right to control and bring into subjection a rebellious State. It took millions of dollars and thousands of lives to establish the principle, but the triumph was worth the cost. We must turn to the same teaching for a solution of the present social problems. The only laws that can ever settle the labor agitations must be passed in Washington. The only remedy for the present complication of marriage and divorce laws is in a United States law that will insure uniformity of rights. It is to the centralizing influence of the "Federalist" that we are indebted for a government which has maintained, and will maintain, itself against internal strife.

The confines of a nation have been too narrow for such a work. The whole civilized world has drunk deeply at this fountain of republicanism. French reformers have followed its teachings. German statesmen have learned the art of federation from it. English writers have praised its sentiments. Mexico has adopted its theories. The republics of South America have found it an inexhaustible mine of political wisdom. The work is immortal. Its influence will continue as long as republican institutions shall exist.



HAMILTON, WEBSTER, SEWARD.

BY WALSTEIN ROOT, '90.



IN the history of the United States three constitutional crises have demanded the highest statesmanship. At the close of the Revolution the united colonies, poverty stricken, jealous of each other, and no longer bound by the urgencies of common danger, were fast disintegrating. The Articles of Confederation had failed; and there was no sovereign government.

In this exigency Alexander Hamilton began the movement for a firmer union. With rare tact, he succeeded in assembling a convention of the States, and to this proposed a constitution based on the idea of a strong central government. On the rejection of this plan, as a whole, he loyally accepted the compromise approved by the majority. Through the "Federalist," with a force and originality never surpassed, he expounded its meaning, explained its effects, and urged its advantages; and by his influence he contributed more than any other to its ratification. He so interpreted its provisions, breathing

into them his own spirit, that the Constitution, in its operation, was more his work than of all the others who framed it. The broad patriotism and greatness of the man were never better shown than when, putting aside all personal pique, he expounded and defended forms and principles which perhaps he feared, yet deemed better than existing dissension and weakness.

Hamilton was the leader, the soul, the original genius of the formative period of our Constitution. He was not only a leader in creating the Convention of '87, not only a leader in its deliberations, not only the foremost advocate and defender of the proposed Constitution; but he was the controlling spirit of Washington's administration, which established the precedents and marked out the course of the new government. Each succeeding generation has but followed in the pathway illumined by his genius, and strengthened and adorned the fabric erected chiefly by his master hand.

Washington, Hamilton, and Jefferson, the generation that formed the Constitution, passed from the stage; the "era of good feeling" came and went; and the country entered upon the stormiest period of its political existence. The conflict again raged round the comparatively untried Constitution. In times of domestic peace and minor political dissension it had stood the test; but now the spectre of State sovereignty, the menace of disunion, so strong in the Convention of '87, vigorous in the contest which followed, mighty in the logic of Calhoun and the aggressiveness of slavery, battled boldly for

constitutional existence. It said, "It is not a constitution, but a compact." "The States are supreme in their sovereignty." The Constitution was at stake; and again there must come a man able to expound its doctrines and make it strong to bind the ever increasing nation. Ten years before, in the Dartmouth College case, Daniel Webster had gained a position among the ablest constitutional lawyers of his generation. In that case, discussing the relations of the general government to that of the State, he maintained the sovereignty of the Constitution. Now, with his soul fired by the taunts and fallacies of Hayne, he combated nullification. His eloquence, making mightier the logic of Hamilton, found an echo in the heart of every loyal American. His arguments were behind the stern vigor of Jackson, when he crushed nullification in South Carolina; and his glowing words, creating a sentiment for nationality, stirred the hearts of those who fought down secession and saved the Union.

The great debate of 1830 left slavery untouched; and twenty years later its menace again brought conflict. State after State had been enrolled in the Union. The question was put and must be answered, "Can the Constitution, broadening with the nation, still keep its grasp and bind into one government a people stretching from ocean to ocean?" With time and growth the problem had become more difficult. Under the Constitution, there were two social fabrics, two political theories utterly antagonistic. Could they be reconciled and the Constitution preserved?

Here Webster erred. His intense love of nationality misled him. The slave oligarchy frightened him with threats of secession. To him there seemed so much at stake that he dared not but compromise.

William H. Seward, calm, able, and with a more spiritual vision than his two great predecessors, saw not only the conflict impending, but where the ultimate right lay. Declaring, as a United States Senator, that "there is a higher law than the Constitution" to which it must conform, he announced the ruling principle of his constitutional career. Later, when the struggle grew fiercer, he boldly asserted, "It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces . . . and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromises, when made, vain and ephemeral." Strong in his calm foresight, he was enabled, as the leader of the Republican party, to prepare for the issue, and, as the controlling mind in Lincoln's cabinet, to help guide the nation to a full constitutional freedom and union. His assertion of the "higher law" and his recognition of the "irrepressible conflict," rank Seward's statesmanship with that of our greatest political leaders.

Hamilton, Webster, and Seward have held positions strikingly similar in the progress of the nation, yet each had characteristics strongly individual. Hamilton was the logical, Webster the oratorical, Seward the ethical statesman.

Hamilton saw clearly that no human law could be supreme; for he said, "The sacred rights of man . . . can never be erased or obscured by mortal


power." But this never became with him a principle of action. With a mind unerringly logical, he wrought out the constitutional life and based it on the principles of political philosophy. Webster, with the logic of a great intellect and the sympathy of a great nature, receiving the Constitution as it was, emphasized and strengthened the principles of liberty and union. He stirred the heart of the nation to sacrifice. Seward, with a spiritual foresight beyond those who dealt merely with human philosophy, not only perceived the "higher law," but realized it. He reconciled the Constitution to conscience and made it more enduring, while he bowed it to the divine law.

Hamilton loved order and distrusted the people ; he would have a strong government. Webster loved the Union ; but forgot the universal right of personal freedom ; he would have preserved the Union at the cost of compromise with slavery. Seward feared God and loved humanity ; he would have had God's law supreme and all men free.

Seward had neither the genius of Hamilton nor the eloquence and sympathy of Webster, and he could not have done their work, but, combined with an intellect little inferior to that of Hamilton and Webster, he possessed a moral sensibility beyond either.

Hamilton's genius lifted him above the mass, and Webster's sympathetic force led him into error. Seward's career is less marred by mistakes, because he trod a lower path and was guided by a cooler judgment.

To-day, in the opening of our second century, our political philosophy is that of Hamilton; the nation's heart still thrills with the eloquent words of Webster, and the conscience of a free and united people says "Amen" to the lofty utterances of Seward.





THE PRINCIPLES THAT DISTINGUISH HAMILTON AND JEFFERSON AS STATESMEN.

BY GEORGE M. WEAVER, '91.



AMONG all the great men who belong to the formative period of our national life, there are two who are especially distinguished, not only for breadth of intellect and lofty patriotism, but from the fact that to them, above all others, we owe the political doctrines and principles upon which our system of government is founded. These two men, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, were the master builders of that political system, under which the United States has prospered as no land had ever prospered before. In it are incorporated their own sound though sometimes opposite theories of government; and their teachings have powerfully influenced the thoughts, not only of their countrymen, but of the civilized world. To them are mainly due the two great documentary landmarks in our history, the one declaring a people "free and independent," the other organizing that people under a national government, whose powers and

duties are definitely settled and carefully balanced, and are guarded and limited by definite methods and to definite ends. Aptly have Jefferson and Hamilton been termed the creator and the organizer of the nation. But while each of these statesmen worked zealously for the welfare of the people, each strove after an ideal of his own; and these ideals though similar in many respects, were in others radically different.

Born a controversialist, and trained from boyhood to close analysis and clearness of expression amid the broils and contentions so common throughout the country just prior to the Revolution, Alexander Hamilton wrought out for himself a system of government far in advance of the conceptions of his contemporaries. Its leading idea was a strong central government, aristocratic in some of its features, but thoroughly republican in form and intent, whose corner-stones were "free representation and mutual checks" in the executive, legislative, and judicial departments. He had but little faith in the ability of the people to govern themselves, and hence believed in the concentration of power in the hands of those specially fitted and set apart to govern. While his officials were to derive their authority from the people, it was his policy to remove their administration as far as possible from the people at large. In pursuance of these tenets, he advocated a chief executive and upper house of the legislature elected for life, and a strong federal judiciary appointed to hold office during good behavior. In a government such as he proposed, the

great danger to the federal power lay with the States ; and therefore he counseled the division of the larger States, and the appointment of the several State executives by the federal executive.

Like Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson was the originator of a policy, and the founder and leader of a party. To him what is known as the democratic idea as it has existed throughout our history owes its origin, shape, and expression. Jefferson's faith in the people was as strong as was Hamilton's distrust of them. While the latter would choose out from among them a governing class and perpetuate its power, the former would have no class distinctions, even though temporary in their nature. He would shorten the term of all office-holding, and remit all government frequently to the people for their ratification or rejection. Jefferson founded his entire system upon the broad theory of the political equality and equal rights of all men. As the natural result of such equality, and as the only sure means of preserving it, he recommended a representative government, based upon universal suffrage. He believed that in order to become competent to govern, every individual should have a share in the government. "Men," said he, "cannot become fit for freedom by remaining slaves."

The second principle which distinguished Jefferson from most of his fellow statesmen, was his doctrine that the sphere of government is limited, and that its action should be confined to that sphere. He held that government has certain well-defined and inherent bounds, beyond which, when it is exercised,

it savors of tyranny, and becomes not only unprofitable, but sometimes injurious. "That government," he maintained, "is best which governs least." The test question, therefore, which should decide the power of the general government over any matter should be, "Is it necessary?" In accordance with this principle, he insisted that affairs of purely local importance should be relegated to the local authorities; and that the maintenance of public security, being the common object, should be the sole duty of the common agent.

Two more different characters than Hamilton and Jefferson can scarcely be imagined. Jefferson was the more literary, more refined, more popular. Hamilton more acute, more practical, more domineering. Jefferson was somewhat lacking in logical ability. His convictions were the result of intuition, of his wonderful creative power. He appealed to the intuitive perceptions of his hearers, and controlled them by enlisting their sympathies in his favor. Hamilton, on the contrary, was strictly logical. He reasoned on every point. The one was a positivist; the other a rationalist. Jefferson was a keen judge of human nature; Hamilton was sadly deficient in this faculty. When he was unable to convince, he attempted to control, and so made himself unpopular.

Hamilton was an aristocrat by nature, a republican in theory and practice. Jefferson was a democrat by nature and principle, but like Hamilton favored a representative republican form of government. Hence it comes that the result of their effort is a

harmonious whole, for while they worked along different paths, they were seeking a common goal. Hamilton feared democracy, because he thought it must lead, as it led in ancient times, to anarchy and ultimate despotism; Jefferson hated aristocracy because it meant tyranny and oppression, and was diametrically opposed to the principles of liberty and equality.

Both Hamilton and Jefferson, each by the adherents of the other, have been too severely judged. The one has been accused of monarchical, the other of anarchical tendencies. Neither charge is true. Hamilton was a monarchist only in that he believed the English form of government the best that had hitherto been invented; Jefferson was an anarchist only in his position that the lowest had equal rights with the highest.

Under the standards of these two statesmen were gradually marshaled the opposing political forces of the country. The Federalists, with Hamilton at their head, distrustful of the people, demanded a stronger central government, an increase of the power and influence of federal officers, and a corresponding diminution in the authority of the States. The Republicans, under the leadership of Jefferson, confident in the ability and integrity of the people, stood for State supremacy and local self-government.

The crowning glory of both Hamilton and Jefferson is, that while each founded a party, both together established, with the aid of their coworkers, a nation.



ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND JOHN ADAMS.

BY JOHN M. CURRAN, '92.



THE Revolutionary period of our country produced two men of marked individuality, Alexander Hamilton and John Adams. Antagonistic in nature, in the struggle for the union of the colonies, they were one in aim and party. Politicians knew them as ardent Federalists, but posterity has chosen to call them statesmen.

Hamilton wholly devoted to the cause of the Constitution the efforts of a wonderfully fertile mind, and lent a personality irresistible in its magnetism and energy. The triumph of the pen that silenced enemies was equaled by the eloquence that brought disciples from the ranks of the opposition and won New York for the Union. At this time his great work began. The period of early nationality was as truly critical as the period of Confederation. The spirit of turbulence pervaded the whole country, warring constantly with the spirit of the Union. The Constitution had been adopted, but it was still but a document. Its hidden power few had

seen; its scope few could realize. The constructive and inventive genius of Hamilton made him the connecting link between anarchy and nationality. His power as a statesman was never so conspicuous as when he overcame the anarchistic repudiating spirit of the colonists, turned the tide of public affairs from war to commerce, and gathered the resources of a weakened people in a grand effort for nationality.

The career of John Adams begins with the rise of liberty in Massachusetts. An orator, a lawyer, and a patriot, he was soon a leader in thought and action. Early satisfied that separation from England could be the only successful outcome, he concentrated his whole energy upon its accomplishment. The third Continental Congress gave testimony to his zeal and eloquence when, after that memorable debate of July second, it declared the independence of the colonies. Yet never was Adams more distinguished in his services than as agent to Holland. The recognition and aid of European powers was the one great need of the new Republic, the earnest of its success. He enlisted the sympathy and confidence of the Dutch in the cause of our people, and then, by a bold but happy stroke, asked immediate recognition. The nation responded, and his cause was won. As a diplomat, Adams had no skill in the arts of indirection or mere manœuver. His power lay in a well-digested plan, and a bold policy. Self-reliant in every crisis, he was ready to stake all on the outcome of a great issue. As President, his public acts were marked by an uncompromising

adherence to his own views of high statesmanship. Too unyielding to be a partisan, in one of the wisest of his public acts, he gave the death-blow to the Federal party.

Alexander Hamilton was a brilliant man. He numbered eminent men among his followers, but was never popular. In his mental cast, he was imaginative, constructive, not philosophic or speculative. He could conceive with all the minuteness of reality any political situation, and master it. He was not visionary but practical, practical to the verge of short-sightedness. He seized the present with an iron grasp and struggled with it; the future he left untouched. Master of the material of the past, accurate in his observation of the present, relentless in logic, he was the great inductive politician of the age. He lived and breathed in the spirit of nationality. This was his mission. The great purpose of popular government he never realized.

John Adams, on the other hand, was a man of great simplicity and directness, a stubborn realist. His nature was fearless. Personal ambition could never make him a coward. Though deficient in tact, he never lacked judgment; and on that judgment, he stood or fell. But he was master of his ideas, never their slave. In his later life, frankness gave way to censoriousness, pride to suspicion. His services were a sacrifice of happiness for his country's good. He worked alone, unsupported by the sympathy of his colleagues. His eminence as a statesman was due to the power of a comprehensive

mind, disciplined by study, quickened by political controversy, combined with the strength of a self-reliant nature. He was not a politician but a patriot, an orator but never a demagogue, a staunch ambassador and a broad statesman.

These two great men were as diverse in character as they were in birth. Born of a Scotch father and a Huguenot mother, Hamilton was shrewd, logical, and at the same time, fervent and impulsive. He responded quickly to a great movement, was fascinated by military enterprise. Adams displayed the old Puritan stubbornness and heroism. He avoided excitement, moved slowly to his decisions, and then stood firm. There was this great difference in the texture of their statecraft. Adams unconsciously allowed the personal element to enter too strongly into his public life. Hamilton could eliminate self. With him, the personal element entered only in the strong grasp of affairs.

If conformity to the great political ideas of a nation is a test of the highest statesmanship, Hamilton had one marked defect. Of the two great principles of American government, centralization and representation, the former alone received his support. He was therefore only half in sympathy with our political system. He himself represented no ideas but his own; his genius was in an executive capacity; his plan of government was only indirectly representative. That he distrusted the great body of the nation, there is no doubt. He could see its weakness, but had no faith in its power to recuperate. Competent, in his day, to appreciate any phase of

American political life, his conception of the ultimate outcome was at fault.

Adams was American by birth, training, and attachment. He grew in his political creed as the nation grew. He knew the people for he was of the people, and was always a representative statesman. His famous reply to George III. is characteristic of the man, "I must avow to your majesty that I have no attachment but to my own country." Adams was a keen, discerning student of American politics, had analyzed the fundamental theories of our government, and was a thorough disciple of its two great principles. A true American in spirit, he well knew the strength of the new nationality, and was in sympathy with its every impulse.

The services of Hamilton and Adams extend through a period of wonderful transition in our national development. Casting in their lot with the rebellious colonies, as the two great pilots of national conservatism, they stood by the helm of state until the success of the Republic was assured. In high-minded statesmanship, and practical government, they were one; in their spheres of action, and political beliefs, complementary. Adams has bequeathed to the national life of to-day two characteristic features of its foreign policy, the spirit of moderation and the attitude of strict neutrality. Hamilton's genius has been the guiding star of our strong nationality, and it still lives in the marvelous adjustment of the federal government to our written Constitution.



ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS A LAWYER.

BY DANIEL W. E. BURKE, '93.



ALEXANDER HAMILTON'S genius was as heaven-born as the poet's; as versatile as that of the philosopher. A young man of twenty-six, he mastered the law in four months and added to its literature a treatise on practice. At twenty-seven, he appeared before the Supreme Court with Robert Livingston opposed. Many of his contemporaries were giants in the profession; but time has passed them over and dust-covered reports are the only witnesses of their greatness. They were lawyers; Hamilton was a genius. He was more thoughtful than the eloquent Morris, more honest than the artful Burr.

Called to the Convention of 1787, Hamilton shaped the Constitution of a sovereign power,—the fountainhead of law. He alone was master of the situation. He knew that a league of independent States could not exist; he had fought against a monarchy. Thus was evolved the Constitution,—a living monument to Hamilton, the constitutional

lawyer. Called to the cabinet of Washington, he executed the laws which he had made. He had neither courts nor libraries from which to cite precedents. He followed authorities to their source, man to nature, nature to God. "Hamilton was the Supreme Court" of the nation; the "Federalist" its opinion.

When the States were united, the Constitution adopted, and public credit established, Hamilton turned again to the court-room. From that time forward he was in active practice, retained in every important case and recognized as the ablest advocate in New York. Yet so chaotic was the system of reporting in those early days, that few of his great cases have come down to us in the books. Indeed but three. These three present Alexander Hamilton, the lawyer, as the defender of truth, the champion of justice, and the expositor of liberty.

A poor boy was accused of a heinous crime. Suspicion fell upon a certain witness. When the man was called, Hamilton placed two lighted candles in such a position that the witness' head was between them. Then, looking fixedly at the witness, he called upon the jury to "look through that man's countenance to his conscience." The man faltered. The jury discredited his testimony. Truth prevailed; and the real culprit died on an English gallows.

His conduct in another case was as characteristic. LeGuen, a Frenchman deprived of his estate by New York merchants, attempted to recover it in the court of errors. Hamilton, who was his attorney,

spoke to a jury of Americans in behalf of a citizen of a hostile country. But with him justice was the one end of law. The facts were with the Frenchman, sentiment and friendship with the defendants. Yet so clearly did Hamilton prove his case, so eloquently plead the cause of justice, that the unwilling jurymen yielded, threw their feelings to the winds, and brought in a verdict for the plaintiff.

But Hamilton's greatest service to his country as a practicing lawyer was in the Croswell libel case. Here he contended not only for the cause, but for two great principles,—First, where the complaint alleges a libelous publication, the truth must be received in evidence, and, if proven, be a defense; and second, the jury shall judge of the intent and the law.

In an attempt to stifle the press, Jefferson's party arrested Croswell, editor of the "Hudson Wasp," on a charge of libel. The case was many times appealed; and Hamilton at last appeared for Croswell before the Supreme Court. Shall the truth be given in evidence? Scripture may become slander. A free press is the bulwark of liberty. Evil must be exposed, right upheld. Thus did he reason against a precedent of the common law as old as that law itself. With prophetic foresight he depicted the dangers of American institutions; not those of an overpowering monarchy, but of a bribed jury and a stuffed ballot-box. "No," said he, "I do not contend for this terrible liberty of the press; but I do contend for the right to publish the truth with good motives for justifiable ends."

But, the other point, Shall the jury judge of the intent and the law? "Judges may be wedded to one idea;" said Hamilton, "a fluctuating body chosen from the people best expresses the sense of liberty." Here we see the author of the American Constitution pleading for the same right which Stephen Langton drew from King John at Runnymede. Thus liberty's strongest exponent was established upon a basis of freedom. To-day, turning the search-lights of criticism upon public men, that press bears witness to the patriotism and foresight of Alexander Hamilton.

In the court-room Hamilton was thoughtful, clear, correct. His understanding was not crippled by the defense of wrong. His arguments were based upon principles rather than authorities. He sought not so much the *lex* as the *jus*. His eloquence was that of justice and right; he appealed to the judgment and the conscience.

No man grasped the whole field of possibility as fully as he. He presented the cause of his adversary in the clearest light. Then, with the case apparently proved against him, he would tear to pieces the fabric he had made, point out the weak spots in his opponent's evidence, and step by step establish what he believed to be the truth. His analysis was exhaustive, conclusive. Little need was there to charge a jury when Hamilton had summed up on either side. With all this, he had a broad knowledge of the law. He applied Mansfield's opinions to American jurisprudence. He taught the profession the value of Emergon and Valin. More, he was a

lawyer whose genius brought as much joy to his heart as it did gold to his purse. Many a cause did he plead without hope of pay. Many another because it was right. He was a man among lawyers, as well as a lawyer among men. The nation has not yet produced a greater.

Alexander Hamilton sleeps in Trinity churchyard, in the heart of the great metropolis. Scores of lawyers may look from their windows upon his grave; thousands more pass it by heedlessly each day. Yet, in these days of the skimming of books, when pleading rarely gets back of precedent to principle; when law but not always justice prevails,—what a shrine is that grave! Pause a moment, heedless thousands! He who sleeps in this churchyard was a lawyer, but he was a man; the cause of the widow and the orphan was his cause. And how laboriously did he strive, how deep did he delve into the hidden treasures of the right! Great was his victory, and greatly did he deserve it. Pause, hasting thousands! Alexander Hamilton, the lawyer, sleeps here.





ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND THE CODE OF HONOR.

BY LEROY F. OSTRANDER, '94.



AFTER years of faithful service, Alexander Hamilton had retired from public life. He had helped to establish a nation ; personal interests now demanded his attention.

Hamilton's private life was simple and beautiful. His loving nature found its greatest happiness in his family. The tender husband, the thoughtful father, the kind, considerate master, he was the idol of his household. An intense lover of nature, he planned for a quiet life in the retirement of his country home. As a lawyer he was fast adding fame and fortune to the greatness of his public renown. Earnest, brilliant, equitable, he won the respect and admiration of his colleagues, the love and gratitude of his clients. A student and philosopher, he aspired to enrich the world with the products of his pen ; to leave a lasting memorial of his genius.

But a cruel fate soon dispelled these hopeful visions. Amid the cares of private life Hamilton

never forgot the public weal. Political affairs continually felt his influence. Those were troublous and trying times, when men stood ready to answer for their opinions with their lives. Between Hamilton and Aaron Burr a mutual antipathy had long existed. Burr was crafty and ambitious, ready to sacrifice the people's welfare for personal advancement. Hamilton had been a barrier, fatal to his hopes. His opposition was intense; his denunciations bold and scathing. Defeated and spurned in national politics, Burr's last hope rested in the governorship of New York. The glory of success was enhanced by a fascinating vision of an independent, Northern republic. The keen mind of Hamilton perceived the danger; his voice was raised in warning. Through his influence Burr was foiled. The disappointed politician burned for revenge; the duel should be his instrument. His rival's utterances easily furnished a pretext, and communications were exchanged. Hamilton could not make the renunciation demanded. The challenge was accepted.

Hamilton condemned the code of honor on moral grounds. His sensitive nature revolted from so brutal a system. No man had more cause to hate the duel than he; for his own family had felt its curse. He had seen his eldest son, a youth of remarkable promise, slain before an opponent's pistol. The risk of his encounter with Burr was appalling. Death meant a desolated home. The possible anguish of his wife and children racked him; their uncertain fate distressed him. His creditors and clients would suffer,—a thought almost unbearable

to a man of his integrity. Blasted all the hopes for professional greatness! Vain the dreams for a happy, secluded life.

Why then did Hamilton accept this challenge? Personal ill will did not impel him. Burr was his political enemy, but the recipient of his private favor. Did he fear the charge of cowardice? No. The courage of the man who had carried the redoubt at Yorktown could not be questioned. Hamilton would have met and outlived any such imputation.

But the eye of this political seer had pierced the mysteries of the future. He saw portentous omens overhanging the Republic. Hamilton believed that centralization was essential for American prosperity. But he feared the dissolution of the Union. Civil discord was rife; sectional feeling bitter and intense. Hamilton also foresaw the impending struggle with England. The American Revolution had been successful; America's independence was yet to be attained. His country might again demand his service. Public opinion was swayed by the despotism of the code of honor; to disregard it would be to impair his influence. Patriotism arose above personal considerations. Hamilton made the sacrifice and entrusted the result to God.

A beautiful July morning witnessed the consummation of the duel. Clear and bright the sunlight was reflected from the peaceful waters of the Hudson. The glories of a summer's morn rested on the woods and hills. But over the Heights of Weehawken the spirit of Death hovered. Silently the prin-

cipals took their positions. The signal was given! A flash! and the bullet of Burr had found its mark. His honor was satisfied; his revenge accomplished. A few hours of suffering, and all that was mortal of Alexander Hamilton lay cold in death.

Thus died, in the prime of life and in the midst of his usefulness, one of the greatest statesmen America has produced. Would we censure his conduct? Would we call him inconsiderate and foolish? We then must be able to rise above the power of public opinion. In death, even as in life, Hamilton was mindful of his country's welfare. We may consider his forebodings erroneous and pessimistic, but we can not doubt the integrity of his purpose. Posterity has judged with charity the closing scene of his life. The bullet that killed the man could not destroy his fame. What a contrast was the fate of his opponent! Burr was ever unprincipled, and by his crafty methods had already lost the popular esteem. But the death of Hamilton fixed eternal obloquy on his name. Driven from his home, he turned traitor to his country, and ever afterward bore the brand of a social outcast. This one, vindictive deed has been the most potent factor in the perpetuation of his worthless memory.

But Hamilton died not in vain. Duelling was a relic of Teutonic savagery. Time was when it had its mission. But it had lost the sanction of thoughtful men. Justice depended not on mere brawn and skill. Mind was superior to brute strength. Philanthropists realized and taught these truths. The pulpit denounced the code of honor; the law forbade

its practice. All in vain. The people had not reached this stage of feeling. But when they saw a man like Hamilton smitten before his time, their country robbed of a life of priceless value, a nation and a world mourning the loss of a universal genius, then they realized the fearful possibilities of the duel. They saw the barbarity and hideousness of its practices; they revolted at its needless sacrifices. They learned "not rashly to sport with life, not lightly to wring the widow's heart with sorrow and fill the orphan's eye with tears." The pistol shot of Aaron Burr had sounded the death knell of the duel in America.

Hamilton was ever a patriot. His early life was devoted unstintingly to his country. His services as soldier, statesman, and financier, stand preeminent in American history. His untimely death removed a mighty intellect and ended a brilliant career. But the influence of this death on society was most salutary. It led to the blotting out of a system incompatible with advanced civilization. From that time a higher spirit of chivalry controlled the lives of men. Alexander Hamilton, great in life, great even in death, has justly merited the gratitude and veneration of his countrymen, in whose service he sacrificed so much.



ALEXANDER HAMILTON'S THEORY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

BY JOHN B. SEYMOUR, '95.



IN the Convention of 1787, Colonel Hamilton offered this as his plan for a United States Senate, "The Senate to consist of persons elected to serve during good behavior; their election to be made by electors, chosen for that purpose by the people. In order to do this, the States to be divided into election districts. On death, removal, or resignation of any Senator, his place to be filled out of the district from which he came. This Senate to have sole power of declaring war; power of advising and approving all treaties; power of approving or rejecting all appointments of officers, except the heads or chiefs of the departments of finance, war, and foreign affairs."

Such a Senate, stamped with the idiosyncrasies of its author, has four distinctive points,—its source; its tenure; the scope of its power; and the purpose it subserves in the system of government.

Its source was not to be the people. Hamilton could not trust them. Looking back into his college

days, he pictured again in memory the fierce throng at Kings. Should mobs govern the new nation? Far better that men of judgment and sagacity, men of influence, chosen by the people, should select our rulers. Such electors would not be moved by party interests; would not be controlled by political bosses. Senators whom they selected would be of spotless character and proved patriotism.

Hamilton was a man from a large State. State rights found no sympathizer in him. Five years' service in the army, where he had seen little Rhode Island fighting side by side with his own New York, was not the training for sectionalism. His year in the Continental Congress had thoroughly sickened him of the jealousy, ingratitude, dishonesty, and discord of State legislation. Consequently his plan of election districts, great divisions of the country regardless of State distinctions.

The Senators were to serve during good behavior. Hamilton was not an absolute believer in the American experiment. His should be a Senate of chosen statesmen, an aristocracy of intellect, not of heredity; of brain, not of birth.

The scope of the Senatorial power was to be three-fold. First, exclusive right of declaring war, a power of vital importance. How fitting that it be reserved for the most permanent body of the nation, in which judgment tempers will; where passion is controlled by prudence. Added to this is the power of advising and approving all treaties, functions requiring the finest talent and the keenest statesmanship. The third power is that of rejection or

approval of appointments, with the exception of heads of departments of finance, war, and foreign affairs; a great check which the Senate should hold over the executive, a sure preventive of party favoritism, and an absolute guarantee that wisdom should govern our country and ability make our laws.

And, lastly, the purpose it subserves in the system of government. Hamilton meant it to be the sober second thought of the nation. A Senate marked in personality, influential in executive power, and well-versed by experience in the forms of legislation. Like the elders of Israel it should consist of gray-headed seers, whose every action should command, and whose words should "gather thunder as they ran."

The Senate actually adopted by the Convention is the result of compromise. In it equality of State representation is the prominent feature. Hamilton's plan contained no such idea of equality. It was not to have State representation at all. What need of States in the central government of free America?

The present Senator is chosen, not by electors, as the "Plan" suggests, but by the State legislatures. Instead of life service, his time is for but six years, and even that seemed over long to the jealous revolutionists of the Convention. The age of the Senator must be thirty-five, and he must have been nine years a citizen.

But the powers of the Senate are in substance those proposed by Hamilton,—two-thirds concurrence on treaties, and advice and consent to the appointment of ambassadors and public officers.

We read in the "Plan," "The Senators are liable to impeachment." The Constitution states, "The Senate shall have sole power to try impeachments." This has been called the greatest power ever granted to any republican deliberative assembly. To use the words of Hamilton himself, "This makes a check on the encroachments of the executive by the most dignified and independent of republican bodies."

Let us for a moment picture this ideal Senate. Behold an august body of grave and reverend seniors, "good men," as their great founder terms them. No foul atmosphere of rotten politics pervades this sacred precinct. No politician who has "sold the truth to serve the hour" sits in that chair yonder. Everywhere are statesmen, wise, moderate, resolute. Men who

" . . . care not to be great
But as they save or serve the state,
Who let their great example stand
Colossal, seen of every land."

Beautiful picture of untrammelled legislation. Wonderful body, far superior to the old Roman Senate, where the haughty patrician eyed with disapproval and defiance the insolent ever-encroaching new party. No blue blood and traditionary rank exist here. All are free and equal. Far above a modern English House of Lords, where worthless generations of sons sit through their father's titles, and where a decayed aristocracy plays at mock government.

Hamilton's plan was presented because it was his

•

firm conviction that the people were not fully capable of governing themselves. His Senate was to be a body chosen by trusted people ; a body representing no small, but a large division of the country ; a body serving on good behavior and with certain definite governmental functions, for to his mind this body, and only such a body, was capable of securing the safety and prosperity of the new Commonwealth.

The history of the existent Senate in some respects justified Hamilton's conception. Its power has been in the experience and ripened judgment of those who have been again and again returned. Thinking and patriotic citizens have mourned when some whirligig of politics has displaced an able and experienced Senator. Hamilton's plan would have removed Senators from menace of political intrigue.

It is possible that election of Senators from districts regardless of State lines might have so hindered the growth of State rights as a supreme allegiance that they would never have disturbed our national tranquility. Is it altogether certain that, amid the conflict of "isms," and the perpetual outcry of factions, a body of life Senators might not furnish a most valuable conservative factor in our government?

It is unjust to balance the untried against that whose faults and weakness experience has shown, but Hamilton's theory of the United States Senate is worthy of his political wisdom ; and our divergence from it may prove a serious fault in our representative system.



A PARTIAL LIST OF BOOKS BY HAMILTON ALUMNI.

- '31. General JOHN COCHRANE. *The American Civil War. Memories of Incidents Connected with the Origin and Culmination of the Rebellion ; including Speech made in 1861. First book advocating the arming of slaves.* New York, Rogers & Sherwood, 1879.
- '34. BELA HUBBARD, LL.D. *Climate of Detroit and the Lake Region.* Detroit, 1874.
- *Memorials of a Half-Century, with illustrations.* New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1888.
- '36. DANIEL HUNTINGTON, LL.D. *Memorial Address on Asher B. Durand.* New York, Century Club, 1887.
- *Some Account of the Early History of the National Academy of Design.* New York, Academy of Design, 1890.
- '45. Hon. BENJAMIN F. ADAMS. *The Best Method of Conducting Granges.* Madison, 1875.
- '45. CHARLES T. PORTER. *A Treatise on the Steam-Engine Indicator and the Development and Application of Force in the Steam Engine.* London, Longmans, 1875.
- *Mechanics and Faith. A Study of Spiritual Truth in Nature.* New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1888.
- '46. DWIGHT H. OLMSTEAD. *The Protestant Faith ; or, Salvation by Belief.* New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1874.
- *Papers on Land Transfer, viz. :
Transfer of Title to Real Estate, with a Synopsis of the New Zealand Act. Read before the West Side Association.* New York, 1881.

196 *List of Books by Hamilton Alumni.*

- '46. DWIGHT H. OLMSTEAD. *Land Transfer Reform. Read before the N. Y. State Bar Association.* 1882.
- *Report to the Legislature as one of the Commissioners of Land Transfer, with draft of Bill for Block Indexing in New York.* 1885.
- *Supplemental Report to Legislature.* 1886.
- *Remarks before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.* 1886.
- *Land Transfer Reform, or the Free Transfer of Land. Scientific Registration and Indexing.* 1886.
- *The Block Indexing Act (now in operation in New York and Brooklyn), and the Act for Short Forms of Deeds and Mortgages.* 1890.
- *Land Transfer Reform, with an explanation of the Block Indexing Act. Read before the American Bar Association.* 1890.
- *Objections to the Torren's System.* New York, The Counsellor, March, 1892.
- '47. Rev. MOSES E. DUNHAM, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D. *Here and Hereafter.* Utica, N. Y., W. T. Smith & Co., 1888.
- *The Philosophy of Prayer.* *Ib.*, 1892.
- *John Hope.* Utica, J. E. N. Backus, 1888.
- *Professor Moreton's Experience.* Utica, Press, 1890.
- *Swissvale.* *Ib.*, 1893.
- *A Unique Vacation.* *Ib.*, 1894.
- '48. CHARLES B. CURTIS. *Rembrandt's Etchings. Fifty of the most notable etchings of Rembrandt, reproduced by the photogravure process; with biography of Rembrandt, and descriptive and historical notes to each picture.* New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1888.
- *Velasquez and Murillo. A descriptive and historical catalogue of the works of Don Diego Velasquez de Silva and Bartolomé Esteban Murillo; comprising a classified list of their paintings, with descriptions; their history from the earliest known dates, names of the present owners, sales in which they have appeared, and engravings after them; also a*

List of Books by Hamilton Alumni. 197

bibliography and a complete index. With original etchings.
London, Sampson Low, and New York, J. W. Benton, 1883.

- '48. Professor EDWARD ORTON, LL.D. (Author, in part.) *Reports of Ohio Geological Survey, viz.: Report of Progress, 1869; 1870. Geology of Ohio. Vol. I, 1872; Vol. II, 1874; Vol. III, 1878.* Columbus, Nevins & Myers.
- (Chief Author.) *Geology of Ohio, Economic. Vol. V, 1884; Vol. VI, 1888; Economic and General, Vol. VII, 1893.* Columbus, Brand & Co.
- *Petroleum and Natural Gas.* Columbus, Smythe, 1887.
- *The Trenton Limestone. U. S. Geological Survey, 8th Annual Report, Part II.* Washington, Government Printing Office, 1887.
- *Occurrence of Asphalt Rock. Kentucky Geological Survey.* Frankfort, Johnson, 1889.
- *Ohio.* In *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Ninth Edition.
- *The Relation of the State to the Public Health.* Columbus, Spahr & Glenn.
- *The Stored Power of the World.* Columbus, 1893.
- '49. IRA F. HART, M.D. *History of Elmira, N. Y.* Elmira, Wheeler & Watts, 1868.
- '50. Hon. ELLIOTT ANTHONY, LL.D. *A Digest of Illinois Reports.* Philadelphia, 1854.
- *The Law Pertaining to the Consolidation of Railroads.* Chicago, 1865.
- *A Treatise on the Law of Self-Defense; Trial by Jury in Criminal Cases; and New Trials in Criminal Cases.* Chicago, 1887.
- *The Story of the Empire State.* Chicago, Legal News Co., 1891.
- *Sanitation and Navigation. Part I. The History of Legislation in Illinois in regard to Canals, etc. Part II. The Story of the Erie Canal. Ib., 1891.*
- *The Constitutional History of Illinois. Ib., 1891.*
- *The Lakes and Rivers of Central New York. Ib., 1893.*
- *Reform in Practice and Procedure.* 1894.

198 *List of Books by Hamilton Alumni.*

- '50. HON. ELLIOTT ANTHONY, LL.D. *Law of Arrest in Civil Cases.*
 ——— *Remember the Pioneers.*
 ——— *Sketch of the Early Bench and Bar of Chicago.*
 ——— *The Government of Russia, and its Judicial System.*
- '50. HON. SIMEON B. CHASE. *Good Templar's Digest.* Philadelphia, Garrigues Bros., 1858. 14th Edition. Edinburgh, Scotland, Morton.
 ——— *Treatise on Parliamentary Law.* *Ib.*, 1858.
 ——— *Manual or Exposition of the Good Templars.* Milwaukee, B. F. Parker, 1864. 15th Edition.
 ——— *Brief History of the Good Templars.* St. Louis, B. H. Mills, 1864.
 ——— *Good of the Order.* Philadelphia, Garrigues Bros., 1870. Edinburgh, Morton.
- '50. JOHN W. SYKES, M.D. *Essays on Chronic Diseases.* Pittsburg, Stevenson & Foster, 1875.
- '51. HON. HENRY M. KNOX. *Seven Annual and Biennial Reports as Public Examiner and Superintendent of Banks of the State of Minnesota.* St. Paul, By the State, 1878-1888.
 ——— *A Uniform System of Public Accounting, with Forms and Explanations for County Auditors and Treasurers.* *Ib.*, 1880.
 ——— *Care of the Public Funds and Treatment of Cash on Hand.* *Ib.*, 1885.
 ——— *Banking Laws of Minnesota. Forms and Instructions for the Organization of State Banks.* *Ib.*, 1886.
 ——— *The Office of Public Examiner ; A Minnesota Notion. Address before the American Bankers' Association.* Pittsburg, By the Association, 1887.
 ——— *The Public Examiner Act. Annotated and published by resolution of the American Bankers' Association for distribution to the Governors and Legislatures of the States of the Union.* New York, 1887.
- '51. CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER, L.H.D.
 (For list of Mr. Warner's works, see end of Bibliography.)

List of Books by Hamilton Alumni. 199

- '52. DANIEL GOODWIN. *The Lives and Services of James Pitts and his Sons in the American Revolution.* Chicago, Culver, Page & Co., 1882.
- *The Dearborns ; a Discourse commemorative of the eightieth anniversary of the occupation of Fort Dearborn and the first settlement of Chicago.* Chicago, Fergus Co., 1884.
- *The Lord's Table ; Shall it be banished from a loyal Protestant Episcopal Church.* Chicago, A. C. McClurg & Co., 1885.
- *In Memory of Edwin Channing Larned.* *Ib.*, 1886.
- *Colonial Pictures with Brush and Pen.* *Ib.*, 1886.
- *In Memory of Robert C. Winthrop.* Chicago, 1894.
- *In Memory of Arthur Brooks.* *Ib.*, 1896.
- '53. Rev. WILLIAM B. DADA. *Immortality of the Soul.* 1867.
- '53. Hon. WILLIAM W. HOWE. *The Pasha Papers.* New York, Scribner & Co., 1858.
- *The Late Lamented.* New Orleans, Clark & Hofeline, 1876.
- *Memoir of Judge F. X. Martin.* New Orleans, Gresham, 1881.
- *Municipal History of New Orleans.* Baltimore, J. H. U. Press, 1888.
- *The Police Power of the State.* New Orleans, Thomason, 1891.
- *The Historical Relation of the Roman Law to the Law of England.* American Bar Association, 1895.
- '53. Rev. WILBUR F. PADDOCK., D.D. *Eyes and Ears Abroad.* Philadelphia, Wm. B. Evans & Co., 1873.
- *Half a Century of Church Life.* Philadelphia, McCalla & Stavelly, 1873.
- *Twentieth Anniversary Discourses.* Philadelphia, Frederick Scofield, 1879.
- *Children's Prayer and Praise Book.* Philadelphia, Martin Rice, 1883.
- '53. Rev. EDWARD P. POWELL. *Our Heredity from God.* New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1886. 5th Edition, 1895. *Gott im Menschen.* Autorisierte deutsche Ausgabe. Berlin, Bibliographischen Bureaus, 1894.

200 *List of Books by Hamilton Alumni.*

- '53. Rev. EDWARD P. POWELL. *Liberty and Life*. Chicago, Chas. H. Kerr, 1889.
- *The Philosophy of History*. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1893.
- *Religion as a Factor in Human Evolution*. Chicago, Chas. H. Kerr, 1895.
- (Editorial Writer,) *for the St. Louis Globe Democrat*. 1871-74.
- (Literary and Editorial Contributor.) *Ib.* 1874-95.
- *Numerous Articles in Arena, New England Magazine, Forum, Education, Independent, etc.*
- '54. CHARLES S. BUNDY. *The Justices Manual of Judicial and Elementary Law. With appropriate Forms*. Washington, By the Compiler, 1880.
- *Bundy's United States Commissaries; containing Forms, Instructions and the Statute Law concerning the Commissaries of United Circuit Courts*. Washington, 2d Edition, 1883.
- *Landlord and Tenant. Law of House-Renting and Room-Renting, with Chapter on Hotels and Boarding-Houses in the District of Columbia*. Washington, Lowdermilk & Co., 1888.
- '56. HON. FRANKLIN H. HEAD. *Shakespeare's Insomnia and the Causes Thereof*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1887.
- *David Swing. Biographical Sketch*. Chicago, Stone & Kimball, 1894.
- *The Heart of Chicago*. Boston, *New Eng. Mag.*, July, 1892.
- *The World's Fair Balance Sheet*. New York, *Forum*, July, 1893.
- *The Fair's Results to the City of Chicago*. *Ib.*, December, 1893.
- *Need of an International Monetary Agreement*. *Ib.*, June, 1894.
- '56. Rev. Professor OREN ROOT, D.D., L.H.D. (Editor.) *The Columbian Speaker*. Boston, Lee & Shepard, 1875.
- (Editor.) *The Franklin Speaker*. New York, Sheldon & Co., 1882.

- '57. Rev. ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D. *The Crisis of Missions ; or, The Voice out of the Cloud.* 16mo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1886.
- *Evangelistic Work in Principle and Practice.* 16mo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1887.
- *The Divine Enterprise of Missions. A series of Lectures delivered at New Brunswick, N. J., before the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, upon the "Graves" Foundation in 1891.* 16mo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1891.
- *The Heart of the Gospel. Twelve Sermons, delivered at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, London, Eng.* 16mo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1892.
- *The Divine Art of Preaching.* 16mo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1893.
- *Love in Wrath ; or, The Perfection of God's Judgments. An address before the Mildmay Conference, London, Eng.* New York, Baker & Taylor, 1893.
- *The One Gospel ; or, The Combination of the Narratives of the Four Evangelists in One Complete Record.* 12mo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1893.
- *Stumbling Stones Removed from the Word of God.* 18mo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1894.
- *The New Acts of the Apostles ; or, The Marvels of Modern Missions. A series of lectures upon the foundation of the "Duff Missionary Lectureship," delivered in Scotland, in February and March, 1893, with a chromo-lithographic map of the world, and chart, which show the prevailing religions of the world, their comparative areas, and the progress of evangelization. With an Introduction by Rev. Andrew Thomson, D.D., F.R.S.E., Edinburgh, Scotland.* Crown, 8vo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1895.
- "A notable contribution to missionary literature."—*Chicago Advance.*
- "It is a unique and invaluable volume."—*Rev. N. H. Belden, D.D., Sec. International Missionary Union.*
- '58. Rev. EDWARD P. ADAMS. *Story Sermons from "Les Misérables."* Dunkirk, N. Y., 1895.

202 *List of Books by Hamilton Alumni.*

- '58. HON. A. JUDD NORTHRUP, LL.D. *Camps and Tramps in the Adirondacks, and Grayling Fishing in Northern Michigan : A Record of Summer Vacations in the Wilderness.* New York, Baker, Pratt & Co., 1880.
- *'Sconset Cottage Life : A Summer on Nantucket Island.* *Ib.*, 1881.
- '58. AUSBURN TOWNER. *Seen Through the Mist. A Poem, delivered before the New York State Associated Press.* Elmira, Advertiser Association, 1876.
- *Chedayne of Kotonu. A Romance of the Early Days of the Republic.* New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1877.
- *Seven Days in a Pullman Car.* New York, Rose, 1879.
- *The History of Chemung County, N. Y.* Syracuse, Mason & Co., 1891.
- *Half-a-Million Acres. A Story of the Pioneer Days of the Empire State.* New York, Peter Fenelon Collier, 1892.
- *The House Terrible. A Semi-Romance.* *Ib.*, 1893.
- '62. CHARLES W. COLE, Ph.D. *Public School Reports. Published annually from 1878 to 1895.* Albany, Argus Co.
- (Editor.) *Choice Readings. With Notes and Biographies.* New York, Sheldon & Co., 1892.
- '63. REV. MYRON ADAMS, D.D. *The Continuous Creation. An application of the Evolutionary Philosophy to the Christian Religion.* Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1889.
- *The Creation of the Bible.* *Ib.*, 1892.
- '63. REV. CHARLES VAN NORDEN, D.D., LL.D. *The Outermost Rim and Beyond.* New York, Randolph & Co., 1882.
- *The Psychic Factor, an Outline of Psychology.* New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1895.
- *What Came of a Sigh.* *American Magazine*, May, 1887.
- *The Human Limitations of the Christ, as described or suggested in the Gospels.* *Andover Review*, July, 1888.
- '64. REV. WILLIAM HUTTON, D.D. *Wanderings in Europe.* Philadelphia, Grant, Faires & Rodgers, 1878.
- '65. REV. JAMES A. FERGUSON, D.D. *History of the Presbyterian Church, Hanover, N. J.* Hanover, 1876.

- '65. HON. LEROY PARKER and ROBERT H. WORTHINGTON. *The Law of Public Health and Safety.* Albany, Matthew Bender, 1892.
- '65. HAMILTON B. TOMPKINS. *Biographical Record of the Class of 1865 of Hamilton College. Printed for the Class.* New York, 1877.
- *Hamilton College, Class of 1865. Minutes of Class Meeting held at Clinton, July 1, 1885. With brief supplemental record.* New York, 1885.
- *Bibliotheca Jeffersoniana. A List of books written by, or relating to, Thomas Jefferson.* New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1887.
- *Burr Bibliography. A List of books relating to Aaron Burr.* Brooklyn, Historical Printing Club, 1892.
- '66. Rev. Professor ABEL G. HOPLINS, Ph.D. *Biographical Sketch of the Hon. O. S. Williams.* Utica, 1881.
- *The Agricola and Germania of Tacitus.* New York, Leach, Shewell, & Sanborn, 1894.
- *In Memory of Theodore W. Dwight, LL.D.* 1893.
- '66. JOHN N. TILDEN, M.D. *A Commercial Geography for Academies, High Schools, and Business Colleges.* New York, Leach, Shewell & Sanborn, 1893; Revised Edition, 1895.
- *A Grammar School Geography, Descriptive, Industrial, and Commercial, with Maps and Illustrations.* *Ib.*, 1894.
- '67. Rev. AMORY H. BRADFORD, D.D. *Spirit and Life. Thoughts for To-day.* New York, Fords, Howard & Hulbert, 1888.
- *Old Wine: New Bottles. Some Elemental Doctrines in Modern Form.* *Ib.*, 1892.
- *The Pilgrim in Old England. A Review of the History, Present Condition, and Outlook of the Independent (Congregational) Churches in England.* *Ib.*, 1893.
- *The Question of Unity. Many Voices concerning the Unification of Christendom.* New York, The Christian Literature Company, 1894.
- *The Sistine Madonna. A Christmas Meditation.* New York, Fords, Howard & Hulbert, 1894.

204 *List of Books by Hamilton Alumni.*

- '67. Rev. AMORY H. BRADFORD, D.D. *Heredity and Christian Problems*. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1895.
- '67. Rev. DAVID R. BREED, D.D. *More Light*. American Tract Society, 1876.
- *Plain Progressive Talks on the Way of Salvation*. *Ib.*, 1877.
- *The Locust Scourge in Minnesota*. *Ib.*, 1878.
- *The Money Question*. Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1882.
- *Abraham: The Typical Life of Faith*. Chicago, F. H. Revell Co., 1886.
- *Plowboy to Prophet*. Chicago, McCormick Seminary, 1887.
- *The Miracle of the Christ*. *Ib.*, 1891.
- *Heresy and Heresy*. Chicago, Young Men's Era Co., 1891.
- *Mind at its Best*. Chicago, Central West Co., 1891.
- *The Life and Services of the Rev. Thomas H. Skinner, D.D.* Chicago, McCormick Seminary, 1892.
- *A History of the Preparation of the World for Christ*. Chicago, F. H. Revell Co., Second Edition, 1893.
- '68. Hon. JOHN D. HENDERSON. *The Village Charter*. H. P. Wittinstine, 1876. Third Edition.
- '69. Professor FRANCIS M. BURDICK, LL.D. *Cases on Torts*. New York, Banks & Bros., 1891. Second Edition, 1895.
- *The Study of Law as a Part of a General Education*. Albany, N. Y., 1888.
- *Our Experience under a Low Tariff*. Ithaca, N. Y., 1889.
- (Associate Editor.) *Johnson's Universal Cyclopædia. Department of Civil, Constitutional, and Municipal Law*. New York, A. J. Johnson & Co., 1894-5.
- '69. JOHN C. FOWLER. *Supplement to the Seventh Edition of the Revised Statutes of the State of New York*. Syracuse, 1888.
- '69. Hon. ELLIS H. ROBERTS, LL.D. *Government Revenue, especially the American System. An argument against the fallacies of Free Trade*. 12mo. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1882.

- '69. HON. ELLIS H. ROBERTS, LL.D. *New York. The planting and the growth of the Empire State.* 2 vols. 16mo. *Ib.*, 1887.

Mr. Roberts has put into less than 800 pages all the truly significant events which have gone to the making up of New York history from 1524 to the present day.—*New York Journal of Commerce.*

- '69. SELDEN H. TALCOTT, A.M., M.D., Ph.D. *Prognosis in Insanity. Reprint from New York Homeopathic Medical Times*, 1878. 18mo, pp. 29.

——— *Medical Notes in the Treatment of Mental and Nervous Diseases. Reprint from the New York Medical Times*, 1879. 18mo, pp. 8.

——— *General Paresis. Reprint from New York Medical Times*, 1880. 8vo, pp. 28.

——— *The Insane Diathesis.* Middletown, N. Y., Slauson & Boyd, 1881. 8vo, pp. 21.

——— *Two Addresses. Published by order of the New York State Homeopathic Medical Society*, 1882. 8vo, pp. 32.

——— *Sleep without Narcotics*, 1883. 8vo, pp. 28.

——— *Application of New Remedies in the Treatment of Mental and Nervous Diseases. Reprint from New York Medical Times*, 1884. 8vo, pp. 13.

——— *Homeopathic Treatment of the Insane. Reprint from the Annual Report of the Middletown State Homeopathic Hospital for 1885.* 8vo, pp. 28.

——— *Hahnemann and His Influence upon Modern Medicine. An Address delivered in Boston, April 12, 1887, before a Convention to celebrate the Semi-Centennial Anniversary of the Establishment of Homeopathy in the State of Massachusetts.* 1887. 8vo, pp. 12.

——— *Traumatic Insanities and Traumatic Recoveries. Reprint from the American Journal of Insanity.* Utica, N. Y., 1888.

——— *An Essay on the Revision of the Laws relating to the Commitment, Care, and Discharge of the Insane.* 1888. Pp. 25.

——— *Annual Address (as President) before the American Institute of Homeopathy, 42d Session, Minnetonka, Minn. Reprint from Transactions of the Institute.* 1889. 8vo, pp. 18.

206 *List of Books by Hamilton Alumni.*

- '69. SELDEN H. TALCOTT, A.M., M.D., Ph.D. *The Hospital Idea. Middletown State Homeopathic Hospital.* 1890. 8vo, pp. 25.
- *Dietetics in the Treatment and Cure of Insanity.* 1891. Pp. 10.
- *Prison Methods for State Hospitals. Reprint from American Journal of Homeopathy.* 1893. Pp. 10.
- *Annual Reports (as Chief of Staff), Homeopathic Hospital, Ward's Island, N. Y. City.* 1875-76.
- *Annual Reports (as Superintendent) of the State Homeopathic Hospital at Middletown, N. Y.* 1877-1895.
- *Modern Phases of Melancholia.* 1894.
- *Degeneration and Regeneration. An Essay read before the American Institute of Homeopathy at Newport, R. I., June, 1895. Philadelphia, Hahnemannian Monthly, August, 1895.*
- '70. ALBERT LEFFINGWELL, M.D. *Vivisection.* New York, Lovell & Co., 1889.
- *Rambles through Japan without a Guide.* London, Sampson Low & Co., 1891.
- *Illegitimacy, and the Influence of Seasons upon Conduct; Two Studies in Demography.* London and New York. "Social Science Series." S. Sonnenschein & Co., and Scribner & Co., 1892.
- *Vivisection in America.* London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1894.
- '70. HENRY C. MAINE. *The Burgoyne Campaign.* Troy, Whig Co., 1877.
- *Prize Essay on the Red Light, 1883-5.* Rochester, Warner Observatory.
- *Does the Sun Influence the Weather?* New York, Frank Leslie's Publishing Co., 1889.
- '72. PROFESSOR H. C. G. BRANDT, Ph.D. *Rules for Writing and Printing German in Roman Letters.* Baltimore, 1878.
- *Lessing's "Nathan der Weise."* Second Edition. New York, Holt & Co., 1895.
- *Grammar of the German Language, for High Schools and Colleges.* Seventh Edition. Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1894.

List of Books by Hamilton Alumni. 207

72. Professor H. C. G. BRANDT, Ph.D. *A First Book in German, together with Lodeman's Exercises.* Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1888.
- *German Reader for Beginners ; with Notes and Vocabulary.* Fourth Edition. Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1894.
- (Editor with Professor DAY.) *Scientific German ; an Introductory Reader with Notes and Vocabulary.* New York, Holt & Co., 1896.
- '72. Professor BRAINARD G. SMITH. *A Tragedy of High Explosives.* New York, Cassell & Co., 1889.
- *Reading and Speaking. Familiar Talks to Young Men who would Speak well in Public.* Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1891. New Edition, 1895.
- (Editor with Professor ROOT.) *The Hamilton Declamation Quarterly.* Syracuse, N. Y., C. W. Bardeen, 1895.
- '72. President MELANCTHON WOOLSEY STRYKER, D.D., LL.D. *The Alleluia.* New York, Biglow & Main, 1880.
- *The Church Praise Book. Ib.,* 1881.
- *Christian Chorals. Ib.,* 1881.
- *Church Song. Ib.,* 1889.
- *Choral Song. Ib.,* 1891.
- *The Song of Miriam, and other Hymns.* Chicago, 1888.
- *Dies Irae. The Great Dirge of Thomas de Celano. The Latin text, a strict prose translation, and three new versions in rhyme.* Chicago, F. H. Revell Co., 1892.
- *Inaugural as Ninth President of Hamilton College.* Utica, By the Trustees, 1893.
- *Lattermath. Poems, original and translated.* Utica, W. T. Smith & Co., 1895.
- *The Letter of James the Just, in eight forms polyglot. Arranged for classes.* Boston, Ginn & Co., 1895.
- *Hamilton, Lincoln, and other Addresses.* Utica, W. T. Smith & Co., 1896.
- '73. Hon. OLIVER E. BRANCH. *College Journalism.* Albany, 1874.
- *The Hamilton Speaker.* New York, Dick & Fitzgerald, 1878.

208 *List of Books by Hamilton Alumni.*

- '73. HON. OLIVER E. BRANCH. *The National Series of Speakers.*
I. Primary Speaker. II. Junior Speaker. III. Advanced Speaker. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1887.

"One great merit of the books is the fact that the pieces are nearly all new."—*Boston Transcript.*

"They are fresh, short, pointed, simple, well arranged, and within the comprehension and speaking power of young people."—*Journal of Education.*

- '73. PROFESSOR THOMAS H. NORTON, Ph.D., Sc.D. *The Battle with Fire, or the Contributions of Chemistry to the Methods of Preventing and Extinguishing Conflagration. Address before Section of Chemistry, A.A.A.S., Brooklyn Meeting.* Salem, 1894.

- '74. REV. GEORGE W. KNOX, D.D. *A Brief System of Theology.* Tokio, 1884.

——— *Outlines of Homiletics. Ib.,* 1884.

——— *Christ the Son of God. Ib.,* 1885.

——— *The Basis of Ethics. Ib.,* 1885.

——— *The Japanese System of Ethics. Ib.,* 1886.

——— *The Mystery of Life. Ib.,* 1890.

——— *A Japanese Philosopher. Ib.,* 1892.

- '75. REV. FRANK S. CHILD. *The History of the First Congregational Church, Greenwich, Ct.* Utica, Curtiss & Childs, 1880.

——— *The Boyhood of H. W. Beecher.* Utica, Childs & Son, 1886.

——— *The Prime Ancient Society.* Standard Press, 1891.

——— *The Sixth Sanctuary.* Utica, Childs & Son, 1893.

——— *Be Strong to Hope.* 16mo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1888.

——— *South Dakota. People, Resources, Statehood.* New York, Baker & Taylor, 1888.

——— *The Gospel of Good Cheer.* New York, Baker & Taylor, 1889.

——— *Children's Catechism.* New York, Baker & Taylor, 1890.

——— *The Friendship of Jesus.* 16mo. New York, Baker & Taylor, 1894.

"A beautiful little volume.' It will appeal strongly to all readers, on the profound and inspiring love which Jesus exercised toward young and old."—*Utica Herald.*

"Strong and fervent words. The Great Friend comes near in the words that breathe His truth."—*Pres. Stryker, of Hamilton College.*

List of Books by Hamilton Alumni. 209

- '75. Rev. FRANK S. CHILD. *An Old New England Town.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.
- '75. Hon. WILLIAM H. DEWITT. *Montana State Supreme Court Reports. Opinions in Vols. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.* Helena, By the State, 1889-95.
- '75. Principal DWIGHT HOLBROOK, Ph.D. *Reading for Our Boys.* New York, E. L. Kellogg & Co., 1885.
- (Editor.) *The Talisman ; by Sir Walter Scott.* Boston, Ginn & Co., 1886.
- '76. Rev. WILLIAM H. ALLBRIGHT, D.D. *Sermons. Pilgrim Series, Vol. 1.* Boston, Blair & Brown, 1891.
- '76. Rev. CHARLES G. MATTESON. *The Doctrines, Fundamental and Essential, in the Formation and Complete Development of Christian Character.* 1887.
- '77. Rev. DAVID ALLEN REED. (Translator.) *Protestant Foreign Missions. By Theodore Christlieb, D.D., Ph.D. Fourth German Edition.* Boston, Congregational Publishing Society, 1880.
- *Outlines of the Fundamental Doctrines of the Bible.* Chicago, F. H. Revell Co., 1894.
- '79. Rev. GILBERT REID. *The New Treaty between China and the United States (1838).* Tientsin, China, Printing Company, 1889.
- *Chinese Law on the Ownership of Church Property in China.* Shanghai, Presbyterian Mission Press, 1890.
- *The Historic Episcopate as a Basis of Church Union in China. Ib.,* 1891.
- *The Duty of Christian Missions to the Upper Classes in China. Ib.,* 1892.
- *The Sources of the Anti-Foreign Disturbances in China.* Shanghai, North China Herald Office, 1892.
- *Peeps into China.* London, Religious Tract Society, and Chicago, F. H. Revell Co., 1893.
- *Chinese Exclusion, its Bearing on American Interests in China.* Rochester, N. Y., Union & Advertiser Office 1894.

210 *List of Books by Hamilton Alumni.*

- '88. Professor HIRAM ALBERT VANCE, Ph.D. *Der Spätangelsächsische "Sermo in Festis Sanctae Mariae Virginis" mit Rücksicht auf das Altenglische Sprachlich Dargestellt.* Darmstadt, G. Otto, 1894.
- '89. SAMUEL G. TRACY, M.D. *Electricity in Medicine.* New York, 1896.
- '90. Professor MELVIN G. DODGE. (Editor.) *Alexander Hamilton. Thirty-one Head-Prize Orations delivered at Hamilton College from 1864 to 1895.* New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896.
- (Editor with D. W. E. BURKE, '93.) *The Clark-Prize Book. The Successful Clark-Prize Orations delivered at Hamilton College from 1855 to 1893.* Clinton, 1894.
- General CHARLES W. DARLING, (A.M., '92). *Anthropophagy, Historic and Prehistoric.* Utica, N. Y., 1886.
- *Memorial to my Honored Kindred.* *Ib.*, 1888.
- *Antoine L'Espenard, the French Huguenot, of New Rochelle.* *Ib.*, 1893.
- *New Amsterdam, New Orange, New York.* *Ib.*, 1893.
- *Versions and Editions of the Bible.* *Ib.*, 1894.
- '95. BURTON M. BALCH. *College Rhymes.* Utica, 1895.



CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER.

THE GOLDEN HOUSE.—A Story. Illustrated by W. T. SMEDLEY. Post 8vo, Half Leather, Ornamental, Uncut Edges and Gilt Top, \$2.00.

It is a strong, individual, and very serious consideration of life; much more serious, much deeper in thought, than the New York novel is wont to be . . . and keeps Mr. Warner well in the front rank of philosophic students of the tendencies of our civilization.—*Springfield Republican*.

A LITTLE JOURNEY IN THE WORLD. Post 8vo, Half Leather, Ornamental, Uncut Edges and Gilt Top, \$1.50; Paper, 75 cents.

It is a study of American life of to-day possessed with shrewd insight.—G. W. CURTIS.

AS WE GO. Social Essays. With Portrait and Illustrations. 16mo, Cloth, Ornamental, \$1.00.

Words cannot convey the refined humor which is Mr. Warner's rarest gift.—*Boston Daily Traveller*.

AS WE WERE SAYING. Social Essays. With Portrait and Illustrations. 16mo, Cloth, Ornamental, \$1.00.

Who but Mr. Warner could dangle these trifles so gracefully?—*Critic*, N. Y.

OUR ITALY. Illustrated. 8vo, Cloth, Ornamental, Uncut Edges and Gilt Top, \$2.50.

Mr. Warner's charming style of writing needs no commendation.—*Observer*, N. Y.

THEIR PILGRIMAGE. Illustrated by C. S. REINHART. Post 8vo, Half Leather, Ornamental, \$2.00.

Mr. Warner's pen-pictures are as good-natured as they are clever.—*Christian Union*, N. Y.

STUDIES IN THE SOUTH AND WEST. With Comments on Canada. Post 8vo, Half Leather, Ornamental, \$1.75.

A book that no American can fail to enjoy, appreciate, and highly prize.—*Boston Traveller*.

WASHINGTON IRVING. With Illustrations. 32mo, Cloth, Ornamental, 50 cents.

PUBLISHED BY HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

al
JW

MAY 26 1930

